THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXX, No. 5 MAY, 1954

CONTENTS

For Church and Pope ..... *Archbishop A. G. Cicognani* 289

Our Lady of Confidence ..... *Thomas Owen Martin* 292

The Passing of a Great Theologian ..... *P. J. Hanrahan* 297

A Question of Punctuation ..... *John P. O'Connell* 302

"On the Seventh Day God Rested from all His Work" *Francis X. Curley, S.J.* 306

The Parish Priest and the Marian Year ... *D. Joseph Corbett* 317

Mr. Maynard and "Popular" American Catholic History ..... *Henry J. Browne* 325

Toleration and the Church-State Controversy *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 330

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Stipends Given to a Schismatic Priest 344

The Obligation to Attend Religious Instruction Classes 344

Predetermining the Sex of an Infant 345

The Commutation of the Divine Office 346

Silver Jubilee Queries 347

Distribution of Holy Communion 347

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1954, by the Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Preceding Page)

Benediction Problem 347
Holy Communion at Afternoon Mass 348
Celebrant at High Mass 348
First Friday and Funeral Mass 349
Minor Basilica 349
Communion of the Mass by the Choir 350

BOOK REVIEWS

The Trinity in Our Spiritual Life, *an anthology of the writings of Dom Columba Marmion* 351
Sermons on the Liturgy, *by Pius Parsch* 352
The Priest of Today, *by Thomas O'Donnell, C.M.* 353
A Doctor at Calvary, *by Pierre Barbet* 355
Self-Portrait of Jesus Christ: The Holy Shroud of Turin, *by Edward A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R.* 356
Theologia Orientalis, *by Nicola Ladomerszky* 358
The Epistles in Focus, *by B. Lawler, S.J.* 360

The hymnal you have been waiting for

THE PIUS X HYMNAL

For Unison, Two Equal or Four Mixed Voices

Compiled, Arranged and Edited by the Faculty of the
PIUS TENTH SCHOOL OF LITURGICAL MUSIC
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart
Purchase, New York

Send for a copy "on approval"

ORDER BLANK

Date .....

Kindly send 1 copy of the Pius X Hymnal "on approval" for 14-day free examination period.

Name .....

St. & No. .....

City and State .....

McLAUGHLIN & REILLY CO.
45 Franklin Street **Boston 10, Mass.**
National Headquarters for Catholic Church Music

FOR CHURCH AND POPE[1]

Please accept heartfelt felicitations on the honor that has been conferred upon you by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, on the occasion of the decennial of your direction and administration of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. Fittingly the honor is the Medal "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice." "Church and Pope" are two cherished realities which, as it were, fill your lives. "Church and Pope"—we live for them. The Church embraces the great congregation of the followers of Our Lord; the Pope is the Vicar of Christ on earth. By the honor you have received, your names will always be more closely linked with these two noble names, "Church and Pope."

This honor comes from the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII as a personal token of his recognition and his deep affection for you on account of your work as authors and writers for *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. Your field is the field of truth, the field of the Church which incessantly seeks to spread truth, the field of Christ Who was born into this world to bear witness to the truth. Today's honor testifies that you are prominent among those who till this field.

It would not be adequate to say that you are merely teachers and writers; to say that you belong to the intellectual class of learned people would be true but insufficient. To express your position and your task well, we must say that you belong to the school of Christ, the Divine Master, that school which preserves and professes knowledge, science and wisdom and which follows the example of Christ Himself "in quo sunt omnes thesauri sapientiae et scientiae" (*Col.* 2:3). In the school of Christ wisdom

[1] [Editor's note] An address by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate to the United States, on the occasion of the formal presentation of the Medal "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice" to the editor and associate editors of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. The decorations were conferred in the name of the Holy Father by the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate on February 25, 1954, at Holy Redeemer College, Washington, D. C., in the presence of the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., Archbishop of Washington and Chancellor of The Catholic University of America, and the Most Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart, D.D., Rector of the University.

holds the first place followed by knowledge so that they operate together in full harmony. In your *Ecclesiastical Review* you have done this for many years and have won the esteem and gratitude of the American clergy.

Your knowledge, therefore, must not be one that is vain but one that leans on the pillars of eternity; your subjects must be not useless and meaningless topics for you too have the warning of the Apostle to his disciples Timothy and Titus: "Sine disciplina quaestiones devita; sciens quia generant lites, . . . sunt enim inutiles et vanae." Yours is the great responsibility of teaching teachers, namely, your readers who are selected teachers, chosen through their vocations by God Himself. Truth is infinitely above poor human things and yours is a vocation for the cause of Christ and of His Church; St. John the Evangelist proclaims your program, "Christus est veritas" (*John* 5:6).

It is the goal of any review to orientate its readers. What other orientation is to be expected of an ecclesiastical review than the proper direction of its readers to Christ and to His Church? Great, indeed, and sublime is your purpose, to guide priests and seminarians to a fuller appreciation and comprehension of Christ, His doctrine and His Church, the custodian, interpreter and disseminator of the *depositum fidei.*

Of such supreme importance is the task of an ecclesiastical review that its purpose might be seen in the same line with the purpose of the Church itself, namely, to edify and to build, using divine and human knowledge. Let us take as an example the construction of a cathedral, an ancient European cathedral. What a tremendous work; every detail, every particular of the edifice required knowledge and wisdom, science, prudence, patience, skill, a sense of measurement, balance, accuracy, precision, perfection. While employing every possible human means suited to their purpose, the builders, one and all, had to keep in mind a clear vision of the imposing, majestic, inspiring cathedral they were laboring to erect. Consider that you are building for Christian life so that even when you write a short article for your *Review* you must keep before your mind the vision of eternal life. By your talents, knowledge, and priestly virtues you contribute to the salvation of souls. Keep always before you the vision of Christ, the perfection of His doctrine, the loving charity of His work of

redemption and salvation, and you may be sure that your contribution to the mission of His Church and its visible Head will be proper and efficient.

To you, our dear friends, so deservedly decorated with the Cross "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice," we extend that good wish expressed by the Holy Ghost to those who teach with wisdom: "Qui ad iustitiam erudiunt multos [fulgebunt] quasi stellae in perpetuas aeternitates" (*Dan.* 12:3).

✠A. G. Cicognani, D.D.
Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate to the United States

Fifty Years Ago

The leading article in *The American Ecclesastical Review* for May, 1904, entitled "Our Glorious Immaculata," by Fr. C. Coppens, S.J., is an excellent account of the development of the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception. In connection with the golden jubilee year of the proclamation the author informs us that Blessed Pius X, on the eve of the feast of the Immaculate Conception, 1903, "receiving the superiors and students of the North American College, reminded them that as their country was especially dedicated to the Immaculate Conception even before the dogma was solemnly proclaimed, they should be, during the coming year, particularly fervent in their devotion to the Mother of God." . . . Fr. H. Borgmann, C.SS.R., writing on "Whitsuntide," describes the ancient celebration of Pentecost, especially in England. . . . Fr. H. P. Russell, in a study on "The Requisite for Reunion," points out the inconsistency of those who are outside the body of the Roman communion and yet claim to be Catholics, for, he says, "to be a Catholic is to be subject to the Vicar of Christ; and they who are not so subject have no claim to the title, theorize as they may, since they belong to no jurisdiction that unites Christians in one visibly Catholic communion." . . . Fr. I. Lissner, of the Missionary Society of Lyons, describes the work of the African missions. . . . In the *Analecta* we find the *Motu proprio* of Blessed Pius X, inaugurating the codification of ecclesiastical law. . . . In the *Studies and Conferences* we read the conditions laid down by the Holy Father for the gaining of the jubilee. It is interesting to note that on the fast day, required as one of the conditions, not only flesh meat but also eggs, butter, milk and cheese were forbidden, and even children were bound to this requirement, if they wished to gain the jubilee indulgence.

F. J. C.

OUR LADY OF CONFIDENCE

"Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary, that never was it known. . . ." Familiar and beloved by the faithful of all countries and all ages are those heart-warming words of the troubadour of Our Lady, the great St. Bernard of Clairvaux. More briefly, the same idea is expressed in the words "*Mater mea, Fiducia mea*" (My Mother, my Confidence) chosen years ago by the then Monsignor now His Eminence Cardinal Borgongini-Duca and endowed with three hundred days' indulgence by His Holiness Pope Benedict XV, as the ejaculation to go with the picture of Our Lady of Confidence honored in a special way in the Roman Major Seminary.

Reproductions of that picture one sees from time to time in this country and likewise from time to time one hears the ejaculation since that night, early in 1941, when a member of the Dominican community of Marywood, Grand Rapids, Michigan, lay dying in a hospital in Muskegon.

After the last rites had been administered, and the last prayers had been said, the Sisters and priests withdrew to the silent corridor while the doctor made some last attempts to keep flickering the tenuous flame of life. Shown a holy card which bore the image of Our Lady of Confidence and the ejaculation, the Sisters withdrew to a vacant room across the hall and there made a vow similar to that made by the Roman seminarians when most of their number were called to the colors in the First World War.

Graciously the Lady accepted their promise to recite certain prayers after Compline each day, in common so long as they should be together and individually if they should be separated, even as she had previously accepted the promise of the Roman seminarians to celebrate a special feast-day in her honor each year, which is observed on the Saturday before Quinquagesima Sunday and on which, unless it is impeded, the alumni, wherever they are, are privileged to say the special Mass of that feast.

The Sister who was ill the Lady brought safely and quickly out of her illness, even as she had brought the seminarians safely through the dangers of the front-lines. Wounded they sometimes

were, and grievously, but she did not let them die in the war, but brought them safely through, just as they had asked.

It is hardly surprising, then, that the grateful community has since then been securing from the Roman seminary copies of the picture and has been propagating devotion to Our Lady under this title, so that now one hears of persons in many places, including the eastern part of the United States, who, invoking her with this abbreviation of St. Bernard's prayer, have obtained help, not only in spiritual needs but also in needs which might seem too material to be noticed, did we not know of her motherly interest even in these things, as was evidenced at the marriage feast in Cana.

The picture itself helps one to realize why we should have this confidence in Our Lady, for it represents the Infant held tightly in His mother's arms, His tiny hand pointing to her, as both He and she gaze calmly and serenely out upon the beholder. If He who is the Son of God had such confidence in Mary as to entrust His Sacred Person to her strong, competent, arms how can anyone fail to have confidence in her? His life on earth was, after all, intended to be an example to all of us that we should live as He did, and the first thing He did was entrust Himself to Mary, His mother.

When we reflect that by baptism we are incorporated in Christ, as members of His Mystical Body, we realize, looking at the picture, that we, too, are enfolded in His mother's arms. So long as we do not deliberately tear ourselves from their fond but firm embrace, what harm can befall us? The blows struck at Him by impious men fall first upon her protecting arms. The attacks against us, if we remain within their loving circle, are likewise cushioned for us.

Even as Our Lord does not take kindly the injuries against His mother, so He is kind enough to consider that whatever is done unto us, the least of His brethren, is done unto Himself. Amid the turmoils of the world, therefore, and the dangers which on all sides beset those of us who make up His Church, what reason have we to be afraid, unless we be of little faith? We have the assurance of protection from the all-powerful God Himself and He, in turn, directs our attention to His mother who has

so often and in so many ways shown herself solicitous for the welfare of the Christian people and capable of securing it, for she has only to ask Her Son and it is done, even as it was at Cana, or in the case of the Roman seminarians who, though sometimes seriously wounded, were not permitted to die of those wounds, but were made whole again, so that they came to be the first ones over the top, confident that she would not forsake them in their hour of danger. We, too, may, at times, be wounded in the struggle for her Son's kingdom, but we can be confident, in our turn, that she will not abandon us.

This love of Catholics for Mary and this confidence that she can and will help them in all their needs has prompted the building of church after church in her honor in this country. It has prompted, too, the wide spread of devotions in her honor in those churches. It has brought the Church in this country, as in every country and in every age, to be profoundly devoted to the Mother of God, whom, according to the prophecy, all ages are to call "Blessed."

Especially during this year set aside for special honor to be paid to her it is fitting that we consider all the things which have been done in this country to honor her whom Christ Himself first honored by seeing to her immaculate conception in view of the fact that she was chosen to be the person from whom He would one day take flesh, that He might live among us in a human nature joined to His divine nature in the one person of the Son of God, and thus might make fitting atonement to His Father for the offenses of mankind against the Divine Majesty.

All too often, misguided men, thinking that they could find a better way to God than that traced out by His Son, have tried to push Mary aside, but as the picture calls to mind, we cannot get to Him locked in her arms unless we go to her to whom He points. Other men, unfortunately, hating God, have realized with diabolical intuition the relationship between the mother and the Son and, wanting to get rid of Him, have sought to get rid of her whose arms they must first strike to deal a blow against Him.

These latter seek, therefore, to hinder the observance of the Marian Year where they can, and to weaken at least, and so, they hope, ultimately to destroy the devotion and love and confidence of Christians in the Mother of God.

They shall not prevail, of course, for Christ has promised that the powers of Hell shall not prevail against His Church, but at times, in the face of the difficulties which they are diabolically clever enough to create, one's heart may grow faint, until one recalls and gains renewed strength from the simple little ejaculation so filled with meaning for all the children of Mary, "My Mother, my Confidence."

Taking new courage from that thought the members of the Church can go forward to attempt, with the laity co-operating in the apostolate of the hierarchy, to restore all things in Christ. Since Christ Himself is to be found enfolded in His mother's arms, this means that they can go forward to attempt to have everyone and everything enfolded in those arms, so tender and yet so capable that to them was entrusted God's most precious gift to mankind, His Only-begotten Son. Difficulties there may be—there always have been traces of cockle amid the wheat—but nothing is too difficult for the grace of God which comes, as does He Himself, through His mother's hands.

No matter, therefore, what trials beset those who strive to make that better world which will acknowledge Christ as its King and so be restored to that peace which the world cannot give itself, they will always be serene, having confidence in their mother and repeating the words of St. Bernard or, more frequently, the ejaculation, "My Mother, my Confidence."

Such serenity is especially needed by a young and vigorous people such as that of this country. Older peoples which have seen much of wars and heresies and schisms are, perhaps, more inclined to remain calm when things are not going well, for they have learned by experience that in the end Christ and His mother always triumph and they do not lose heart at the temporary setbacks which the Church sometimes receives. A young and enthusiastic people, however, caught up with the grand idea that Christ must rule, may not be so capable of understanding that He will do so in His own good time and that all He asks of His followers at any time is that they do their best for His sake and leave to Him the decision as to what the result shall be in any given epoch. If He decides, as He often does, that the final goal should not be reached all at once, for there are other things to be accomplished in the meantime, enthusiasm may wane and

courage may fade. Then is the time when we need to remember that it is all in His hands and that He is in her arms, and say, as calm returns so that we can once more control our activities so that they will be most effective in His service, "My Mother, my Confidence."

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE POOR AND THE PARISH

We would be greatly helped in studying the obligations of a parish toward its own poor if pastors who feel satisfied that they have met the problem effectively would make known generally the plans that they found satisfactory, the views that had inspired these and the way in which difficulties had been overcome. Standing together as we do in our love of the poor and our faithful acceptance of the command of Christ, it should not be difficult for us to find the way to adequate understanding of poverty and its implications. Nor should we fail to attain to unity of effort at whatever cost and to such a quality of service and such assistance in mastering the causes of poverty as will vindicate the spiritual motive that we cherish, by bringing the best of which we are capable to the service of these His least brethren.

—Msgr. William J. Kerby, in "The Obligations of a Parish toward its Poor," in *AER*, LXVIII, 1 (Jan. 1923), 37.

THE PASSING OF A GREAT THEOLOGIAN

On Friday, January 8 of the present year, there was an unmistakable atmosphere of bereavement in the presbyteries of Britain. The morning papers carried the announcement that Canon Edward J. Mahoney had passed away the day before. The priests realized with a sense of grief that they had lost a great friend. He had been solving their practical problems for many a year, and in doing so he had earned throughout the English-speaking world the reputation of being one of our foremost theologians.

Edward Mahoney was born in London in 1888, and when he manifested a desire to study for the priesthood he was sent to St. Edmund's College, the seminary for Westminster Archdiocese. Cardinal Bourne, impressed by his character and ability, sent him to the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. It was here that he first came into contact with American students, and soon became a close friend of many of them, joining the *Columbia*, their Academic Society. His interest in American ecclesiastical activities remained throughout life, and he was never happier than when handed a parcel of Washington dissertations for purposes of review. He had a real admiration for the thoroughness of research at The Catholic University of America, and was eager to discover the new fruits of effort in that direction. His studies were interrupted by World War I, during which he served as a chaplain and gained valuable experience. After the war he was sent back to Fribourg by his Archbishop to get his doctorate.

He selected for his dissertation the work of a learned English theologian, Gregory Sayrus, O.S.B., 1560-1602, whose scholarship seemed to have been forgotten even in the distinguished Order of which he was a member. Father Mahoney made a close study of his works, and gave a very clear portrait in the thesis, *The Theological Position of Gregory Sayrus*, published in 1922. Its author learned many things from the example of the man of whom he wrote, notably the place of St. Thomas in the history of moral theology; and the absolute need to get back to speculative principles in the solving of moral problems. There is nothing that emerges so clearly from his book as his fine understanding of the difference between the proper kind of casuistry and the quibbling variety which had gained a bad reputation for moral theology.

He saw too, in his reading of the history of moral, the unhappy consequences which would arise from a confusion between the internal and the external forum, which at one time led to sharp discussions between moralists and canonists. The thesis was written and successfully defended in about six months, so that Cardinal Bourne marvelled when his young priest arrived back in England with an S.T.D. already to his name. Father Prümmer on more than one occasion told the present writer that Dr. Mahoney "had an extraordinary capacity for work and was a promising writer."

He was appointed Professor of Moral Theology at his old College, St. Edmund's, and from the start endeared himself to the students. His exposition had the qualities of solidity and limpidity and he had no difficulty in holding the attention of an audience. His lectures were enlivened by many anecdotes, always with a view to illustration. His wisdom was seasoned by a quick and ready wit: to an enquirer who asked if suet pudding was allowed on Friday, he said the problem should be solved *modo sueto*. In lectures and controversy, indeed in all his social dealings, he was a model of courtesy and modesty. His past pupils, now numbering about five hundred, could write to him on any point of moral theology and be assured of an answer by return of post. But queries came from all over the country and sometimes from the United States.

In 1930 he published *The Secular Priesthood*, a volume intended to explain the priesthood to students, possible candidates for the ministry, and also to parents. The book had a favorable reception at both sides of the Atlantic. He had already written on the topic in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. It was about this time that there came to fruition a project that had long been discussed, the establishing of a clerical review for priests on the English Mission. Since the restoration of the hierarchy, the numbers of the clergy had grown enormously and with the four major seminaries well established and adequately staffed there were opportunities for academic and pastoral studies which a few generations previously were undreamed of. Archbishop Downey, a great patron of clerical studies, was chairman of the Editorial Board. Canon Myers, President of St. Edmund's, and Dr. T. E. Flynn, Vice-Rector of Upholland (the seminary for Liverpool Archdiocese) were made joint editors of *The Clergy Review*.

From the inception of the *Review*, Dr. Mahoney dealt with queries on moral theology and canon law; nor did he, like so many writers on the latter subject, carefully steer clear of matters rubrical. His reputation as a safe guide quickly grew, and he became a kind of resident oracle. His training stood him in good stead, and the orderly, methodical, and scientific character of his approach to a question is adequate answer to anyone who may question the utility of the written doctoral thesis. He assembled a remarkable file of articles, replies, and notices of various kinds, which provided information at a moment's notice on almost any point or topic which might come his way.

The variety of the matter sent to him for solution was astounding. Happily he was prevailed on, largely through the persuasion of his first editor, now Bishop of Lancaster, to publish his *Questions and Answers* in two volumes. This thesaurus of ecclesiastical learning contains no fewer than 732 replies on every conceivable point of pastoral work. There is probably nothing quite like it in any language. The questions are stated simply and the answers follow. The relevant text of canon law, or decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites follows, then the views of the writers; and, where there is a difference of opinion, the author assesses the relative value of the arguments, and with evidence of much wisdom and shrewdness gives his practical conclusion. Most priests prefer his work to the well-known volumes of *Casus conscientiae*. These undoubtedly have their points but Caius and Sempronius often have a note of the continental European which is not that with which we are quite familiar.

The medico-moral section in the second volume of *Questions and Answers* is a useful compendium. It was a branch of moral theology which greatly interested the author. He was also conscious of the necessity of knowing thoroughly the rules on co-operation with non-Catholics, a subject of perennial importance in England. The need for unfailing fidelity to episcopal guidance in this field was something he often stressed. As to the development of theology and law, his great authority made an important contribution in the matter of servile work and of the ecclesiastical fast. He felt, no doubt correctly, that, in both cases, there was occasion to move with the times, and to correct an anomalous discrepancy between the *sensus fidelium* and the stereotyped teach-

ing of some textbooks. Under the title, "Bondmen or Free?" he made a fine analysis of the problem of servile work which in condensed form appears in his *Questions and Answers*. It had a far-reaching effect in England and elsewhere, helping to settle doubts of conscience and to create a wholesome public opinion.

One of his greatest interests was the law on ecclesiastical fast. Here again, there was a disconcerting contrast between the requirements of the law and its actual observance. He crusaded for the adoption of the "relative norm" for the subsidiary repasts, and missed no opportunity of advocating the "mild view" of many recent writers. His influence on public opinion in the matter must surely be considerable, but, at the present time, England is still experiencing "lean years," and one must await fuller days to see how successful Canon Mahoney's advocacy has been. In one of his last letters to the present writer, he said with what pleasure he noted the adoption of the "relative norm" in a number of American dioceses.

World War II brought its problems, and almost immediately after its outbreak came the problem arising from the provision of V. D. prophylactics for the troops. His treatment of this question is one of many fine examples of the poise and balance of his judgment. "Reprisals" were later to provide difficulties of conscience, and these too he faced calmly, stimulating the kind of discussion which brings enlightenment. The Pontificate of our Holy Father Pope Pius XII has been prolific in legislation affecting pastoral work. The Decree *Sacrosanctum* on marriage, *Spiritus Sancti* on confirmation and *Christus Dominus* on the Eucharistic fast would by themselves suffice to make the rule of His Holiness remarkable. Canon Mahoney had the happy art of seeing, as if by intuition, the difficulties latent in a legal text. On the first two Instructions he wrote valuable commentaries in the form of small books; had he been spared he might have completed the useful trilogy. In these, as in all his writings, there is a freshness of approach and lightness of touch which made his work so very readable and attractive. If there ever could be a "theology without tears," then it would certainly be with Canon Mahoney as master.

For many years he lived with the staff at St. Edmund's College. For a time he was pastor of a small parish but found this incom-

patible with his professorial post. He became chaplain to a convent, which runs a school for girls. We have heard it said that he was never one second late for his morning Mass. He loved the Liturgy, and had the art of inspiring his young charges with an understanding of it. Years before the publication of *Mediator Dei*, he wrote an excellent article on the subject urging the discreet adoption of liturgical practices and giving practical examples of how damage due to exaggerated zeal should be avoided. One of his activities was to give days of recollection near the Cathedral to his fellow-priests. How greatly they enjoyed the sincere words of this gentle, spiritual man!

He lived alone in a lodge attached to the convent, cooking his own meals. He enjoyed seclusion, but it must be stressed that it was not the seclusion of the odd or eccentric. If all were as normal as he was! He was the most sociable of men; he enjoyed playing his violin and an occasional game of chess. From his cottage home he answered the queries that came in large numbers by every mail. Here, too, he was found dead, at his table, having passed away, it seems, four or five hours before the discovery which saddened his fellow-priests throughout the land. For they realized that a master in Israel had left them; "a great priest" said Cardinal Griffin. As a colleague remarked, "Death came suddenly as he would have wished; for a priest of his genuine piety it could not be unprovided."

P. J. HANRAHAN

St. Joseph's College
Upholland, Wigan, England

A QUESTION OF PUNCTUATION

In the preface of the Mass a phrase occurs ("Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus") which seems to be incorrectly punctuated in the *Missale Romanum*.[1] Careful study of the sources of this phrase in early texts has convinced scholars that the commas are misplaced. In place of: "Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus," it should read: "Domine, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeterne Deus."[2]

In the Missal the phrase occurs also in the preface that is a part of the blessing of the baptismal water on Holy Saturday. And there, too, the punctuation is the same as that found in the Mass prefaces. It was interesting, therefore, to note that when the Holy See published the new *Ordo Sabbati Sancti* on February 26, 1951, the punctuation of this phrase in the *Missale Romanum* was abandoned and what scholars consider the more correct form was made the official one for the Easter Vigil service.[3]

The momentous changes introduced into the Holy Saturday service seem to have distracted editors of English translations from this minor, but not unimportant, modification in punctuation. For some of them have failed to recognize it.

[1] This phrase occurs in thirteen of the fifteen prefaces in the *Missale Romanum*, i.e. in all except the prefaces for Easter and for the Apostles. It also occurs frequently in prefaces and in orations in the *Pontificale Romanum*.

[2] Cf. Jean Juglar, O.S.B. "'Sancte Pater,' Note sur la ponctuation de la formule d'invocation de la Preface," *Ephemerides liturgicae*, LXV (1951), 101-104. The position of Dom Juglar (scil. that the punctuation should be "Domine, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeterne Deus") was contested by A. Cousin in "De genuina interpunctione formulae 'Domine sancte Pater omnipotens aeterne Deus,'" *Eph. lit.*, LXVI (1952), 77-80. But in the discussion which continued in "Ancora sulla interpunzione del prefazio," *Eph. lit.*, LXVI (1952), 282-83, in Jean Juglar, O.S.B., "Post scriptum sur la ponctuation de la preface," *Eph. lit.*, LXVI (1952), 373, and in articles in other periodicals the thesis of Dom Juglar was sustained.

[3] The decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites announcing the Easter Vigil was dated Feb. 9, 1951, and published Feb. 26 with the text of the

As far as I have been able to determine, eight pamphlet translations of the Easter Vigil into English have appeared. They are listed here:

(1) *The New Easter Vigil Service and Mass,* by Rev. Philip T. Weller (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1952).

(2) *Holy Saturday, New Rite,* by Rev. A. Biskupek, S.V.D. (Techny, Illinois: Mission Press, 1953).

(3) *The Easter Vigil Service,* by the Monks of Conception Abbey (Conception, Mo.: Abbey Press, 1953).

This pamphlet has appeared, in its entirety and printed from the same type, also as an appendix to the Proceedings of the 1952 Liturgical Week (*The Easter Vigil,* edited by A. Wilmes [Elsberry, Mo.: The Liturgical Conference, Inc., 1953]).

(4) *Order for the Restored Vigil of Easter* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1953).

This pamphlet, while it is published in the United States, seems to have been printed in England. The *Imprimatur* is from Westminster (England, not Maryland), and the typesetting seems to have been done in England. Unfortunately, no mention is made in the pamphlet of the responsible editor.

(5) *The Easter Vigil,* by Leonard David Perotti, O.F.M. (Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1953).

(6) *The Easter Vigil Arranged for Use in Parishes,* by Godfrey L. Diekmann, O.S.B. (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1953).

---

rite—*Ordo Sabbati Sancti.* It authorized the Vigil service for only one year, 1951.

A decree of Jan. 11, 1952 (published Jan. 25) extended the optional use of the new rite for three more years (1952-3-4); and a new *Ordo Sabbati Sancti* was issued, with a few rubrical and textual changes suggested as a result of the 1951 experience. The phrase under discussion remained the same in both editions of the *Ordo Sabbati Sancti.*

Easter of this year was the last time, according to the present permission, that the Vigil service could be used. It is confidently expected by many that the permission will be renewed, perhaps permanently, before Easter of 1955. New rites for the Holy Thursday and the Good Friday services are also thought to be in preparation.

(7) *Easter Eve* (Abbey of St. André, Bruges, Belgium: The Liturgical Apostolate, 1953).

This pamphlet is published in two sizes, one vest-pocket size, the other about the size of the large Saint Andrew Missal. But the text is identical in both.

(8) *The Easter Vigil,* by Rev. Gerard Montague (Saint Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland: The Furrow, 1952).

Of the eight pamphlets listed[4] the first five translate the "Domine, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeterne Deus" of the *Ordo Sabbati Sancti* as "holy Lord, almighty Father, eternal God." The five translators seem to have overlooked the change made by the Holy See. And the editor of No. 4, the only one of the five that includes the Latin text with the English translation, has adjusted the punctuation of the Latin found in the *Ordo Sabbati Sancti* to conform to his own English translation!

The last three listed pamphlets translate the phrase: "O Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God." It seems that only Father Diekmann, Father Montague, and the anonymous translator of the Belgium edition have taken note of the change and have made a correct version. What is remarkable is the fact that all translators did not immediately see the new punctuation. For it came as no surprise, since scholars had discussed the point and had pretty well agreed that the *Missale Romanum* should be amended in this detail.[5]

The failure of five of the eight editors of English versions of the Easter Vigil Service to take account of this correction deliberately made by the Holy See only underlines the need for greater

[4] One Missal, the new edition of the large Saint Andrew Missal, is advertised as containing the new Easter Vigil service. What it contains is an 11-page appendix at the end of the book, which outlines the new Easter service, gives the text in Latin and English for a few of the new formulae, and refers the reader back to the regular Holy Saturday service in the body of the book for most of the text. For the blessing of the baptismal water which contains the phrase 'Domine, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeterne Deus" the reader is referred to the regular Holy Saturday service. There, strangely, one finds the new punctuation in the old Holy Saturday service.

[5] The author of "Ancora sulla interpunzione del prefazio" calls the position taken by Dom Juglar a thesis "gia avanzata da qualche anno da buoni liturgisti" (*Eph. lit.*, LXVI [1952], 282), and he cites books published in 1931, 1940, 1948, and 1949.

care with translations of liturgical texts. Such work cannot be done by any competent Latinist. It is a work for a man trained in Christian Latin, a man acquainted with the vast liturgical research of the last fifty years, and one familiar with contemporary literature in the field. In 1930 the Holy See established an historical section as a part of the Congregation of Rites. Among its functions are the correction and publishing of liturgical books.[6] Perhaps a similar group, if called into existence in America, could give us better English translations of the liturgical texts.

JOHN P. O'CONNELL

Chicago, Illinois

[6] *AAS*, XXII (1930), 87 f.

THE QUEENSHIP OF MARY

The Holy Scripture calls God in an absolute sense "the King" (Psalms 44 and 144), to set forth in this understandable way the supreme excellence and power and splendor of the Divine Majesty. He is the one only Lord, *Dominus*, whom all creation must serve. Mary is also rightfully called Queen, as St. Thomas in a gentle, filial phrase says, "because she is the Mother of the Lord." "Quia Mater Domini . . . Maria est Domina." It might be expressed in another way. Because Christ is King, His Mother is Queen and Mistress of the world. All the reasons supporting the privileges of Mary derive their real breadth of meaning from the position of Mary, Mother of God, towards creatures, as sovereign Mistress and Queen, and from her vocation of closest cooperation in the redemption of man by the victory of Christ her Son.

Archbishop O'Boyle, in his paper, "The Queenship of the Blessed Virgin Mary," read at the International Mariological Congress held at Rome during the week preceding the definition of the dogma of Our Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven. From *Alma Socia Christi: Acta Congressus Mariologici-Mariani Romae Anno Sancto MCML Celebrati* (Rome, 1952), III, 159 f.

"ON THE SEVENTH DAY GOD RESTED FROM ALL HIS WORK"

This paper could be called "Some Aspects of the Exegesis of Genesis" or, more facetiously, "Some Aspects of the Genesis of Exegesis." Rather in the Caroline Spurgeon manner, the author has gone through all the references in Migne's *Patres latini* to *Genesis* 2:2, "On the seventh day God rested from all His work," tracing the various interpretations of this verse, from Victor Martyr (3rd century) to Master Bandinus (12th century). The task has been somewhat complicated by the cheerful abandon to plagiarism which marked much medieval writing. One starts to read, for instance, Rabanus Maurus; this chap is good, simple, clear . . . but then the uneasy feeling of "haven't we met somewhere before?" creeps in, and with it the realization that the last twenty lines or so sound very much like a passage recently come across in some other commentary. A check-back is called for, and it turns up the fact that not a single word in this part of the commentary is original, but rather the paragraph is a patchwork of quotations from Venerable Bede.

When all the "borrowing" has been eliminated by extensive parallel-column work, several distinct interpretations of the text emerge. For appeal, Ambrose rates highest; for bizarre wanderings of the mind, it is a close race between Victor Martyr and Remigius; for sweet simplicity, Bede; and for exhaustive ramifications of interpreting, Augustine. A brief summation of the findings, arranged according to opinions rather than in strict chronology, is expressed in table form as follows:

NUMBER AND TYPES OF OPINIONS ON GEN. 2: 2
from 3rd to 12th centuries

1. Chiliasm	VICTOR MARTYR (3rd cent.)
2. To square with *John* 5:17, explained as cessation from creating new *genera*, but not from concursus.	ALCUIN (735-804) AUGUSTINE (354-430) BEDE (672-735) HUGH OF ST. VICTOR (1096-1141) JULIAN OF TOLEDO (7th cent.) MASTER BANDINUS (12th cent.) quotes Bede without acknowl.

	RABANUS MAURUS (776?-856) quotes Bede without acknowl.
	WALAFRID (d. 849) quotes Bede and Augustine, with acknowl.
3. To square with *John* 5:17, not a real rest, but a symbol of future reward for us.	AUGUSTINE
	BEDE
4. Expresses God's Omnipotence.	BEDE
	WICBODUS (8th cent.)
5. An Exhortation to goodness.	AMBROSE (340?-97)
6. Judgment Day; Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost.	HONORIUS (fl. 1106-35)
7. Mystical explanation.	REMIGIUS (d. 908)
8. Other interpretations:	AUGUSTINE
a. Death of Christ.	
b. Contemplative Life.	

I. CHILIASM

The very earliest Father to comment on this text was Victor Martyr, in the 3rd century.[1] He seems to have been under the delusion, shared by some of the early writers, that the twentieth chapter of the *Apocalypse* refers to a future temporal reign of Christ on earth, prior to the general resurrection. While most adherents to this belief put the period of Christ's visible kingdom at one thousand years, Victor, by blandly combining the twentieth chapter of the *Apocalypse* with the second chapter of *Genesis,* comes up with seven thousand years. He is not the oddity that he sounds like, though. Jerome had various opinions about Victor, but in general thought highly of him, even referring to him as a pillar of the Church.[2] The closest to unkindness that Jerome (who had a unique gift for waspishness) comes is in a letter wherein he states that "although Victor Martyr lacks erudition in his books, the will to be erudite is certainly present" ("Victorino Martyri in libris suis, licet desit eruditio, tamen non de est eruditionis voluntas").[3] In another letter he writes, "What Victor

[1] The term "Father" is used throughout in the loose sense in which Migne employs it; in no wise is it limited to the great Patristic writers strictly so called. The translations from the Fathers, wherever they occur, are my own.

[2] *S. Hieronymi opera,* Lib. I contra Ruffinum, cap. 2 (Verona, 1742), II, 459.

[3] *Opera,* Epistola LXX, sect. 5, I, 427.

knew, he could not impart."[4] But these last two statements must be understood in a special sense. Victor, who was of Eastern extraction, was sent to Italy for his ministry; and in his middle years he took up the study of Latin. He found it extremely difficult, but persevered and poured out enormous quantities of ungrammatical low-quality prose in the unfamiliar language. It is to this foggy writing that Jerome refers. When we add excessive addiction to allegory and an affinity for Chiliasm, it makes for heavy going. But the latest opinion on Victor is that he is well worth more study and attention as the golden link between Origen's Alexandrian world and the West.[5]

He briefly indicates the connection between the day of rest and the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths (as Augustine will do later), but his chief concern is the mystical and allegorical import of the number seven. His chiliastic concept is stated thus: the seventh day of rest refers to "the seven thousand years during which Christ will reign triumphant with His Elect."[6] Mystical corroboration is found by Victor in a score of biblical references, chief among which are these:

"seven horns and seven eyes which are the seven spirits of God" (*Apoc.* 5:6)
"seven lamps which are the seven spirits of God" (*Apoc.* 4:5)
"I saw seven golden lampstands" (*Apoc.* 1:13)
"a scroll sealed with seven seals" (*Apoc.* 5:1)
"seven eyes of the Lord that run to and fro through the whole world" (*Zach.* 4:10)
"you shall offer seven lambs without blemish" (*Levit.* 23:18)
"in that day seven women shall take hold of one man" (*Isaias* 4:1)
"seven men full of good repute and the spirit and wisdom" (*Acts* 6:3)
"from the going forth of the word . . . unto Christ, there shall be seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks" (*Dan.* 9:25)
"whosoever shall kill Cain shall be punished seven-fold" (*Gen.* 4:15)

Their only unity seems to be in a mention of the magic word "seven," but what connection this has with a seven-thousand year terrestrial kingdom of Christ is puzzling, to say the least.

[4] *Opera,* Epistola LVIII, sect. 10, I, 324.
[5] *DTC* (1950), XV, tom. II, 2882 ff.
[6] *Fragmentum de fabrica mundi* (*MPL,* V, 309-12).

Victor's is a prime example of tendentious writing; he began with a chiliastic concept, and had no trouble finding texts to support it, however shakily.

II. NO CONTRADICTION OF JOHN 5: 17; CONCURSUS

By far the commonest approach to the text "on the seventh day God rested from all His work" is to set it up in opposition to some later words of Christ, "My Father works, even until now" (*John* 5: 17), and to resolve the apparent contradiction. Eight of the Latin Fathers use this method. The problem, perhaps a real one, but more likely an exercise in ingenuity (since the apparent contradiction doesn't seem to be a world-shaking one), concerns a God at rest and a God who is always working. The briefest and clearest explanation is given by Alcuin: "He desisted from determining upon and creating any new creatures, but not from the guidance of those already determined upon and created."[7]

Augustine concurs[8] (one of his many interpretations of the passage), as does Bede[9] in a partial manner, omitting the notion of concursus: "Not as if exhausted from excessive labor like one subject to human weakness did God rest when He had fashioned the fabric of the world, but He is said to have rested from His universal labor in that He ceased creating any new *genera* of creatures. For it is the custom of Sacred Scripture often to use the word 'rest' to indicate the cessation of some word or work: 'and the four living creatures do not rest day and night, saying "Holy, Holy, Holy"' (*Apoc.* 4: 8)."[10] Julian of Toledo nods agreement,[11] together with Master Bandinus[12] and Rabanus Maurus[13] who quote Bede *verbatim* without any acknowledgment. Hugh of St. Victor adds a notion omitted by the rest when he states that God "works every day in creating new souls; and also in propagating one thing for another. But this is not to say that He

[7] *Opuscula exegetica Alcuini*, Op. I, 305 (*MPL*, C, 517).
[8] *De Genesi ad litteram*, Lib. IV, cap. 12 (*MPL*, XXXIV, 304-05).
[9] *Opera exegetica, Hexaemeron*, Lib. I (*MPL*, XCI, 34).
[10] Bede, *loc. cit.*
[11] *Antikeimenon*, Lib. I, interrog. 9 (*MPL*, XCVI, 599).
[12] *Sententiarum liber secundus*, de Mundi Creatione, dist. 15 (*MPL*, CXCII, 1043).
[13] *Commentaria in Genesim*, Lib. I, cap. 9 (*MPL*, CVII, 465).

creates new *genera* of things."[14] Standing out as a sterling example of literary honesty is Walafrid Strabo, in that he not merely gives echo to the opinions of Augustine and Bede, but he tells us where he got his ideas; something most of the others never dream of doing.[15]

This interpretation, then, is the most common one. God, on the seventh day ceased creating new *genera* of creatures (and in that sense "requievit"), but He has never ceased to proffer His concursus and His conservation of what He has created (and in that sense "usque modo operatur").

III. NO CONTRADICTION OF JOHN 5:17; OUR REST

Augustine also resolves the conflict between the texts with an explanation which is listed as the third opinion on our chart. He uses the occasion to pronounce a generalization on exegesis, warning that there are similitudes and allegories in apparent contradictions like this one. He bids the unwary to "pass over to Christ, so that the veil may be taken away, as the Apostle says" (*II Cor.* 3:16).[16] This text, continues Augustine, can be clearly understood as a common biblical figure of speech. The verse means a reward after doing a good job; it refers to *us*, and to *our* heavenly futurity, if we do all that is commanded us. Other examples of such biblical usage are found by the Saint in this verse: "God tries you, so that it may appear whether you love Him with all your heart and soul, or not" (*Deut.* 13: 3). That is, for *you* to find out; and in this one: "That day and hour no one knows, not even the Angels of Heaven, but only the Father" (*Matt.* 24:36). That is, it is not for Him to say, since it is useful to His hearers *not* to know. Augustine gives the same explanation, but with different citations, in another book. "Just as God is rightly said to do whatever is done when *we* are the agents, so He is rightly said to rest

[14] *Summa sententiarum*, Tract. III, cap. 1 (*MPL*, CLXXVI, 90). Authenticity doubtful. Probably written by contemporary, Othon de Lucques (cf. *DTC*, s.v. Hughes, 251-57).

[15] *Glossa ordinaria*, Lib. Gen., cap. 2 (*MPL*, CXIII, 84-5). Not authentic. Written about 150 years later by Anselm de Laon, "Doctor Scholasticus" Such was his repute that Abelard gave up teaching to attend his classes (cf. Spicq, *Esquisse . . . exégèse latine* [Paris, 1944], 44, 112).

[16] *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, Lib. I, cap. 22 (*MPL*, XXXIV, 189-90).

when *we* rest in His gifts."[17] It is a manner of speaking that can be confirmed by this scriptural example: "Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God in whom you are sealed for the day of Redemption" (*Eph.* 4:30). The Holy Spirit is said to be saddened, but it clearly refers to the laudable penitence of sinners, which springs from a love that the Holy Ghost has inspired.

It is, continues Augustine, not only a biblical usage, as the foregoing examples have abundantly shown, but also a common everyday usage; and he proves his contention in the following way: "We say a certain day is cheery or joyous when we mean that we are . . . we say that a cold day is sluggish because it makes *us* sluggish."[18] In the same way, he concludes, "we say that on the seventh day God rested from all His exceedingly good work because we will rest one day after doing our tasks well."[19]

There is an interesting sidelight, of use to preachers, in seeing how Augustine takes this rather dry disquisition on grammatical usages and makes it come alive when adapting it for a sermon. The same ideas are expressed, but now warmly and personally; a good example even today for the framing of dogmatic preaching. "In this verse God promises rest to each one of you, burdened down as you are with troubles, in order that you might realize that, after your good fight here, there is in store for you—yes, you—a resting place, and what is more, an eternal resting place."[20]

Venerable Bede also ventures this interpretation in the *Hexaemeron*.[21] Later, in the *Opera exegetica*, occurs one of those clear and concise sentences which so frequently adorn his prose. "For us, this day signifies rest because, if we will only make of our works *good* works, we will take up our rest with Jesus Christ forever."[22]

Thus, these two Fathers find in *Genesis* 2:2 a clear promise of future beatitude for those who fulfill their earthly pilgrimage in accordance with the Will of Him who took His rest as a pledge of ours.

[17] *De Genesi ad litteram*, Lib. IV, cap. 9 (*MPL*, XXXIV, 302). Italics added.

[18] *Contra Man., loc. cit.* Italics added.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Sermo IX*, cap. 5 (*MPL*, XXXVIII, 80).

[21] Liber I (*MPL*, XCI, 35).

[22] *De sex dierum creatione*, de die septima (*MPL*, XCIII, 218). Italics added.

IV. GOD'S OMNIPOTENCE

While it has no historical validity, I like to think that Venerable Bede's explanation of how *Genesis* 2: 2 refers to God's Omnipotence was incorporated into his exegesis after having been used in a sermon to children. It has the ingenuousness and delightful plausibility that are supposed to be hallmarks of medieval writing, but real examples of which one comes across so infrequently. With a Curé d'Ars sort of simplicity he tells us that "God blessed the day on which He created nothing, to show us that it wasn't any effort at all for Him to create. He just said 'fiat' and 'facta sunt.' "[23]

An historical-comical-pastoral problem arises from the quotation just cited. The villain of the piece is one Wicbodus (or Wigbodus, or Wigbaldus, or Wicboldus, and so forth, who may or may not have been the Wigbaldus known to history as Charlemagne's Secretary-Chancellor). This Wicbodus wrote a book dedicated to Charlemagne, and composed, it would appear, before the year 800, for Charles is referred to in the dedication merely as King of the Lombards and Franks. The book, *Liber quaestionum super librum Genesis,* is compiled, the author assures us, from the writings of Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, Ambrose, Hilary, Isadore, Eucherius, and Junilius. No plagiarist he. In it occurs this exchange:

Disciple: "Why did He bless the seventh day on which He created nothing?"

Master Jerome: "God blessed the day on which He created nothing, to show us that it wasn't any effort at all for Him to create. He just said 'fiat' and 'facta sunt.' "[24]

Though I speak with the tongues of angels, if I have not the correct references. . . . The section is obviously taken word for word from Bede's work which appeared between seventy-five and a hundred years before Wicbodus wrote. Now then, did Wicbodus quote Bede, and mistakenly attribute it to Jerome; or did he deliberately and falsely attribute it to Jerome; or did he actually quote Jerome, and thus show Venerable Bede to have been a

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] *Lib. quaest.,* de die septima (*MPL,* XCVI, 1136).

plagiarist? To answer these questions, I consulted the extensive Migne indices relative to Jerome, as well as the even more extensive ones in the eleven volume *S. Hieronymi opera* (Verona, 1742). Saint Jerome does not appear, anywhere in his vast exegesis, to have commented on this text. Wicbodus, it would seem, should have added Bede to the eight authors from whom he admits taking quotations; and Bede is no longer under suspicion of stealing from Jerome.

V. EXHORTATION TO GOODNESS

Perhaps the most appealing approach to "On the seventh day God rested" is that of Saint Ambrose. He does not go in for extensive speculation like Augustine, nor does he spin out the far-fetched mystical comparisons of later writers. His general approach to Gospel commentary is to find a simple little lesson, easily taught and easily retained. It was not for supersubtle and quibbling minds that he wrote, but for the child-like minds that are so dear to Christ. For them the moral he draws from this text is clear, and it offers a principle by which to guide their lives.

> Do not be deceitful, or cruel, or lacking in mercy, in order that Christ might come and rest His head upon your bosom. When God made the great monsters of the deep, when He fashioned the families of wild and ferocious beasts, He did not relax from His labors. Listen, now, to the story of where He rested: "Upon what will I rest, unless upon the lowliness and tranquillity of those who fear my words?" (*Isaias* 66:2).
>
> Be, therefore, humble and sincere, and God will rest within a soul like yours. He, who did not relax from His labors in the company of beasts, will surely never take up His rest in a soul that has the tendencies of a beast.[25]

VI. JUDGMENT DAY; THE SEVEN GIFTS OF THE HOLY GHOST

A certain author, asked once to comment on the writings of Honorius of Autun, ventured that they do not lack a touch of the mysterious. There is something to this. Honorius can and does flatly state, for instance, that God finished His work in seven days because the world will last seven thousand years.[26] Easier to fathom,

[25] *Hexaemeron*, Lib. VI, cap. 8 (*MPL*, XIV, 277).
[26] *Hexaemeron*, cap. 3 (*MPL*, CLXXII, 259).

perhaps, is a later observation on the same: "just as we read that God on the seventh day rested from all His work, so are believed to rest in their tombs the bodies of the Just, after their struggle; their souls truly rest in joy."[27]

The precise focus of Honorius' attention is directed to the number "seven" in the text; and he gives the distinct impression that if there had been seven Commandments, or seven Apostles, or seven Theological Virtues, they would all be prefigured in *Genesis* 2: 2. As it is, besides the seven-thousand-year duration of the world, "by the rest on the seventh day is prefigured the rest of souls in the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost."[28] One wonders what meaning he would have found if the Holy Ghost had not limited His gifts to such a convenient number.

With an echo of the third opinion, Augustine's and Bede's, that God's resting is an earnest of our rest, Honorius sees Gabrielitic glimmerings in the verse too. "The seventh day also means Judgment Day, when the entire work of the Church will be completed. Eternal rest will be the Church's recompense."[29]

Honorius closes his section on the resting of souls in the Holy Ghost, and the resting of the Church in God, with some prose that rises to poetic quality. This seventh day, he tells us, "will not terminate with a nightfall, since that rest which is coming will not be foreshortened by any appointed end."[30] These lines had much more meaning in the 12th century, when nightfall was a time of evil and terror, plague and violence. In heaven there will be no coming on of shadows, but only perpetual daylight, clean and sweet and pure.

VII. MYSTICAL EXPLANATION

The chief mystery about Remigius of Auxerre's exegesis is what on earth or in heaven he is talking about. His comments seem to be merely a vaguer manner of expressing the notions of Honorius and Victor Martyr; but since this isn't certain, he has been accorded a very brief section all his own. This then is the revelation of Remigius: on the seventh day God rested "because the seventh age is the age of the resting of souls in Christ, and the general resurrection of the bodies of those waiting."[31]

[27] *Ibid.* [28] *Ibid.* [29] *Ibid.* [30] *Ibid.*

[31] *Commentarius in Genesim*, cap. 2 (*MPL*, CXXXI, 59).

VIII. OTHER AUGUSTINIAN LIGHTS

To complete our survey, it only remains to state briefly some other opinions hazarded by Saint Augustine. He had a fertility and an ingenuity of mind which surpassed the gifts of all the other exegetes. Most were content either to discover or to echo one interpretation; Bede has three to his credit; but Augustine, after the lengthy expositions of his two main ideas (2 and 3 on chart), sets down some half-dozen secondary insights into *Genesis* 2: 2. They are of unequal worth, and some are straining things a bit, but they have a definite value, in that they reveal the workings of an extraordinary and most active mind. The two which follow are typical.

A. *The Death of Christ:*

When Our Lord was approaching the end of His life, He frequently observed that His time was at hand, that He was completing the task the Father had set before Him, that His work was to fulfill all things. And finally, seconds before His death, Christ cried out "It is consummated" (*John* 19: 30). To this Augustine remarks: "what wonder if, for a foreshadowing, as it were, of the day in time when His Son would lie at rest, God rested a day Himself, and then began the forward order of the centuries?"[32]

B. *Defense of Contemplative Life:*

Here Augustine speaks plainly for himself, without comment or introduction. "God was not weary when He created, not refreshed when He rested, but He wished, through the Scriptures, to exhort us to a desire of peace—indicating to us here that He Himself declared holy that day on which He rested from His labors."[33] He declared that what He did on the other days was *good,* but what He did on this day was *holy.* "The same is indicated to us in the Gospels, where our Saviour tells us that Mary, because she is waiting at His feet and resting in His words, has chosen the better part."[34]

[32] *De Gen. ad litt.,* Lib. IV, cap. 11 (*MPL,* XXXIV, 304).
[33] *Ibid.,* cap. 14, 305-306.
[34] *Ibid.*

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the best way to conclude would be to refer the reader back to the table of findings near the beginning of the essay. They were placed there as a directional guide when we started out, and they could again be placed here as a brief summation, which in fact they are.

It only remains to glance at our authors chronologically. One or two of them defy a pattern, but most fall into definite and significant categories. It becomes evident at once that the 3rd to the 7th centuries were exegetically inventive (Victor, Ambrose, Augustine, and Bede). The 8th and 9th centuries were an echo chamber for quoting earlier voices (Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, Walafrid, and Wicbodus). The 10th to the 12th centuries were curiosity seekers (Remigius and Honorius). This is a general confirmation of the accepted historical evaluation of these periods in Church History . . . the golden Patristic outpouring, the dreary repetition of the ideas expounded in former times, and finally the stirrings, the seeking and the searching that was to fully flower in 13th-century sanctity and scholasticism, in the Renaissance, and in the counter-Reformation.

FRANCIS X. CURLEY, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

THE PARISH PRIEST AND THE MARIAN YEAR

We live in a world consecrated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary; we are the privileged citizens of a nation dedicated to Mary's Immaculate Conception; we share the joy of the Church in the recent proclamation of the Assumption of our Lady as a defined doctrine of christianity; we are consecrated priests, set apart for the service of the Church and irrevocably bound to Christ, in a vocation that manifests a striking parallel with the exalted calling of Mary Immaculate. Certainly, there can be no doubt whatever of Mary's unique position in our lives and in the lives of our people. The *Fulgens corona* of Pope Pius XII, in announcing the centenary celebration of the definition of the Immaculate Conception, proclaims for the universal Church a special Marian Year, and thus stresses again the tremendous place of Mary in the spiritual life of the Church. This directive of the Holy See offers us a further motive for honoring with prayer and praise the name of Mary, and it would seem that the desires and recommendations of the Holy Father would be best fulfilled by a more intense concentration of devotion to Mary within the three fundamental spheres of Catholic life: in the life of the family, in the life of the parish, and in the life of the priest.

Mary has a special place in the spiritual life of every Catholic family. The ultimate perfection of Christianity must be found in the home, since family life is the backbone of every parish and the real strength of parochial Christian living. The parishioners of whom we are most proud are the mothers, fathers, and children whose loyalty and fidelity to each other reflect but another aspect of their allegiance to Christ and His Mother. The home demands a strong spirit of vital religion, if the family is to survive; mutual love and reverence must flourish, if the spirit of peace and happiness is to pervade the multiple relationships of family existence. If the home is to be more than a material structure of bricks and mortar, if the family is to be more than a vaguely united group of individuals, then there is demanded a well-knit unit of minds and hearts vivified by a soul; and that soul is charity. Ideally, the home constitutes a school of sanctity in which Christian virtue

prospers; perfect is the home that reproduces in miniature the holiness of Nazareth's holy family.

Yet, we know only too well that the kingdom of the family is under heavy attack from many quarters. The wreckage of broken homes and broken hearts increases with time. Stability is sorely lacking; confusion, boredom, uncertainty saturate the lives of too many men, women and children. Naturally, such an atmosphere creates ideal climate for all the modern moral ills; e.g. divorce, birth prevention, marital infidelity, juvenile crime, alcoholism. The Holy Father affirms that the "root of all evils by which men are harshly and violently afflicted and peoples and nations straitened, has its origin in this especially, that many people have forsaken Christ." Therefore, the encyclical reminds us that "if there has been a wandering, there must be a return to the straight path."

Under whose guidance and leadership could we hope to find a surer and safer return to family peace and security than the sinless Mother of God? Mary is God's perfect creature, fully formed according to God's image. The temple of her soul God adorned with every conceivable grace. She is indeed the woman among women. In a singular manner has God blessed her. This blessing Gabriel announced to the world in the angelic salutation. Elizabeth echoed this same divine benediction upon Mary's visitation. The woman of the gospel proclaimed to Christ and to the pressing crowd the greatness of Mary: "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee, and the breasts that nursed Thee" (Luke 11:27). The *Fulgens corona* would have us pause and reflect to discover if our generation fulfills Mary's expectation.

Our examination of conscience should bring the resolve to utilize the Marian Year as a vast spiritual crusade to establish family prayer in the homes of our people. Where the Family Rosary Crusade has visited, much warm enthusiasm has greeted this spiritual project. The Marian Year for the family should be the instrument, under God, that will re-establish Mary's rosary. Today, especially, there is grave need for family prayer centered in Mary; without doubt, this can be the recommended unitive and vital force that will bring the true living of the Christian life into the homes of our flock. The Holy Father would have us place the rosary in the hands of even the smallest of our children, that the blessed beads will bind all the members of the family to the

Immaculate Heart of Mary and through this means unite mothers, fathers, and children with one another.

Certainly, a Catholic family in any way indifferent to Mary argues a family blind with sin; a family that cannot comprehend Mary's greatness and cannot feel the need of her intercessory power suggests a family narrowed and trapped by an earth-bound paganism; a family that never mentions her name in prayer, that has no place for her statue in the home, is a family attempting the impossible—striving to pulsate without a heart. To the family struggling through all the problems of life to win eternal salvation, Mary represents hope and power before God. As families of a nation recently branded with the gaping wounds of three wars and still no peace, we must remember that she is patroness of our country. In the woman who knew not sin, each member of the family has the ideal, the hope, the inspiration, the pledge of help in the great consuming task of living and dying without sin.

Since it is the Holy Father's wish that there "grow up a generous and promising youth, pure and unblemished, and that the beautiful flower of youth may not suffer itself to be infected by the corrupt breath of this world, and grow up in vice," Pope Pius XII prays particularly that the young may "raise themselves up to whatever is beautiful, whatever holy, lovable and elevating." Certainly, these words apply with special emphasis to Mary of the Immaculate Conception. Our age is truly the age of concern about our youth. Too many of our young people have confused minds, lack a real sense of responsibility, have lost a sense of sin, and care not for laws even if made by God Himself. Delinquency, both juvenile and parental, increases with time; the temptations and moral dangers that confront the young are frightening. The encyclical holds out for imitation, for strength, and for consolation the sinless Mother of God. And the Holy Father desires that this joyous celebration "should not only serve to revive Catholic faith and earnest devotion to the Mother of God in the souls of men, but Christians should also, in as far as possible, conform their lives to the image of the same Virgin." The solution to family friction, the secret of family stability, the assurance of family survival, the answer to the complex conflicts of modern family life, lie in devotion to family prayer in honor of Mary that would urge all to "that innocence and integrity of life which flees from and abhors even the slightest stain of sin."

Mary has a special place in the spiritual life of every Catholic parish. This is the will and the intention of the Church, continuing the desire of Christ Himself. On the cross Christ announced and revealed the mystery of Mary's spiritual maternity over the whole infant Church. Pentecost, the birthday of the Church, found the fearful apostles huddled securely about the Queen of apostles. This same spiritual security is ours today if we center our parish about the sheltering and sanctifying influence of Mary Immaculate. The Marian Year would have us inquire if Mary's place in our parish is a firm, deep-rooted, and solid one. The Holy Father proposes no spiritual novelties in devotion; he advocates no new radical Marian piety. He does not command that we put Mary into the parochial life, for he realizes that she is already there. Pope Pius XII would have us unite our spiritual efforts and endeavors to give Mary the prominence she deserves; the encyclical calls forth our highest enthusiasm, a more intense parish spirituality revolving about the sacred person of the Immaculate Mother of God.

The parish sodality of the Blessed Mother should therefore make this Marian Year a time of great advance in Mary's cause. The *Fulgens corona* offers a more lofty motive for sustained spiritual striving, a further impetus to extoll Mary's virtues, honor her name, and imitate her life. The work of the sodality in the parish should carry with it special significance this year, inspiring our people to a more heroic loyalty and a more zealous love for Mary.

The Legion of Mary should have a banner year in its work of reclaiming souls for Christ under Mary's gracious patronage. This work so dear to the heart of Christ, the Good Shepherd, a work which continues so zealously Christ's search for the wayward and the prodigal, succeeds only in the measure that a strong Marian spirituality flourishes among its members. The lost sheep do not find their way home by accident; apostolic men and women, whose love for Mary spurs them on in this work of Catholic action, make the journey possible. The Marian Year should mean the year of the great return of souls to the fold of the Church.

Doubtless, we have at least one of Mary's many novenas in our parish. Hearing Mary's plea at Fatima, we urge and encourage the First Saturday devotion for peace and the return of sinners

to God. In most dioceses the prayer for peace is either the *oratio imperata* or a special plea made after the Leonine prayers. Mary is the Queen of peace. There is opportunity in our study groups of the confraternity to highlight the prerogatives of Mary. On the various Marian feasts that occur frequently in the liturgical year, we have the privilege and the obligation to offer wholesome, solid sermons to serve as instruction, inspiration, and hope for our people. The month of May brings a daily service to our Lady; October places Mary's beads in our hands in the special month of the rosary. The Holy Father recommends specifically a solemn novena to the Immaculate Conception at the time of the feast; certainly this is the ideal manner of inaugurating as well as concluding this important spiritual enterprise. We should encourage the Sisters to keep the children alerted by appropriate posters and displays. A special Marian shrine or altar in the school might be a helpful and continual reminder for the children. We ourselves have ample time to remind the children in the classroom and also in our confessional advice.

The annual May Procession could certainly be an extraordinary manifestation of our deep love for Mary, a source of much inspiration and great grace for every parish. The Holy Father recommends the use of pilgrimages to Marian shrines. For those who visit the nation's capital, the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception will be the ideal pilgrimage church, but most will find that the pilgrimage can be more conveniently made at a local Church dedicated to our Blessed Mother.

In a material way, we should urge generous giving to the special financial appeal for the completion of the Shrine. In this way our nation will soon boast a beautiful national Church to our Lady, an edifice of beauty, built upon the sacrifice and love of the American people, something worthy of our nation so bountifully blessed by God, an expression in brick and stone of the American Catholic's attachment and reverence for Mary our Mother.

Mary has a special place in the spiritual life of every Catholic priest. Since the priest is an apostle whose mission is to save souls, then certainly he cannot afford to neglect the secret charm and grace of the Blessed Mother in his work of drawing men to Christ. The magnetic power for good inspired in souls by Mary's attrac-

tiveness is a spiritual energy that will produce an unexpected fruitfulness in our ministry. We will never be able to laud sufficiently Mary's merits, her incomparable vocation as Mother of God, her surpassing sanctity of soul, the exalted glory of her privileges, or the powerful influence of her intercession. Our sermons, therefore, must be the fruit of much study and more prayer. We can hardly do anything more fitting this year than to consecrate to Mary Immaculate the ensemble of our priestly efforts, our plans, our hopes, our spiritual progress. Certainly we cannot do anything more salutary for our parish than to entrust its whole spiritual life to Mary's special guidance. Especially should we dedicate the instruction of converts, the guidance and direction of youth, and the spiritual care of the sick and the aged. Also earnest efforts should be made at this time to inculcate within the children a loyal love for Mary, that our young people may be blessed with the gentle manners of the chaste generation of Catholic children.

In a more personal way for our own private spiritual life, the Marian Year must force us back to a truth already etched deep in our minds and hearts, namely Mary's exalted place in our own vocation, her boundless maternal care through the years of preparation in the seminary, and her vigilant protection now in the priesthood of her Son. During this year, ours is the privileged opportunity to deepen our affection for Mary through the reverent offering of Mass, the prayerful rendering of our public prayer in the Breviary, and the daily fingering of our rosary. Our preaching by word some may consider quite elegant and inspiring, but we must remember that no sermon is quite so effective, no discourse quite so stirring as the sight of the priest at the predieu, intent in prayer and rosary in hand. If we urge, therefore, the families of our parish to participate in the Church's great endeavor at this time, then the initiative and the greatest fervor should be found first within the most important family of the parish, the family of priests at the parish rectory.

As an expression of our filial homage, we might feel inclined to recite our divine office before the Blessed Sacrament on Mary's feasts. Our love for Mary may prompt us to present into her keeping the merit and indulgences gained in this year to be dispensed at her discretion to souls who need the mercy of God most. Very

generous indulgences are available throughout the entire year. A plenary indulgence can be gained after confession and Holy Communion, a visit to a church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and the recitation of the usual prayers for the intention of the Holy Father at the following times: Immaculate Conception, Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, Nativity, and Seven Sorrows of our Blessed Lady, also any Saturday of the Marian Year by a pilgrimage in a group to a church dedicated to the Blessed Mother, any time one attends a sacred ceremony in honor of the Blessed Mother. Also all altars dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary are privileged in favor of those faithful departed in God's grace for whom a Mass is offered there by any priest.

Toward the end of the *Fulgens corona,* the Holy Father makes a special appeal that our prayers and sacrifices during this Marian Year arise to God's throne through the intercession of Mary that the Church may enjoy freedom in the world. In his paternal care the Holy Father reminds us sorrowfully of the suffering of our scattered brethren enveloped by the hammer of hate and the sickle of brute force. Pope Pius would turn our gaze to the millions of men, powerless victims of today's godless world, condemned in their helplessness to slavery and death. God is still being mocked. Christ once again walks the streets of the world, ridiculed, scourged, spit upon, crucified. Pilate and Herod still preside at unjust trials; the Church, like her Master, is buffeted by vulgar and coarse men, in their steady and forceful conspiracy to strip from man his allegiance to Christ. The Holy Father would have us pray for the prelates and priests who have been imprisoned, drugged into insensibility, deprived of their very reason, with the fortunate ones being quickly extended the martyr's crown. We must think of the heroism of our consecrated Sisters who have suffered abuse and confinement in concentration camps that could only have been devised by devils in human flesh. We must think of Christ's faithful separated from loved ones with so many mercilessly butchered.

Though we know that the Church will never be destroyed and that the enemies of God will never dethrone Him from the heavens nor succeed in emptying the tabernacles of the world of their Eucharistic King, still these martyr bishops, priests, religious, and laity need much grace to meet their hour of trial. Our

prayer to Mary for them will mean light in the time of darkness, strength in time of fear, joy in time of sorrow, peace in time of anxiety, and perseverance to the end. This request of the Holy Father asking for special prayers for our persecuted brethren has been seconded by the American Bishops in their annual meeting held last November. In a moving, heart-stirring statement entitled, "Peter's Chains," the Bishops of the United States proclaimed to all priests and people "the solemn duty of instant and constant prayer for our suffering brethren of the Church of Silence." This statement concluded with the tribute of Pope Pius XII to the Church's modern martyrs: "We embrace you with a special love and we kneel to kiss your chains."

By her singular privilege of the Immaculate Conception Mary has been blessed among all women, raised by God above every saint, made more glorious than any angel, exalted to the very pinnacle of creation, up to the highest abode of any contingent being, to a dignity, a power, and a glory next to that of God's own Son. It is to this Mary that the Holy Father recommends that we consecrate the work of the Church during this year; it is to this Mary, the ideal and inspiration of all motherhood, that Pope Pius XII desires the dedication of families in prayer; it is to this Mary that the multiple works of our parish should be entrusted, that she may give them vitality, enthusiasm, and power for good; it is to this Mary, the Mother of Christ the Priest, that we priests should reconsecrate the work of our priesthood; it is to this Mary, Queen of Martyrs and Comforter of the Afflicted, that our petitions should arise for the suffering and the prosecuted, that this Marian Year of 1954 will open a real movement of our souls to the Heart of Christ through devotion to the Immaculate Queen of heaven and earth.

D. Joseph Corbett

Washington, D. C.

MR. MAYNARD AND "POPULAR" AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY

The publication of Theodore Maynard's volume, *The Catholic Church and the American Idea,* some months ago by a reputable secular publisher (Appleton-Century-Crofts) points up a current vogue of interest in American Catholicism. The scramble for the articles which were carried serially last year in the *Commonweal* on the same question is also symptomatic of that interest. The latter, however, were more observations and opinions on the current trends in the Church of the United States, while Maynard professed to deal with the more clearly established facts of Catholicism in this country—its history, nationality complexion, and its contribution to American life. This is a book which was meant to be popular and undocumented; yet because of the scholarly writings listed at its conclusion one may presume that it was intended to be considered factual and not fictional. In this reader's opinion, however, it stands out as a flagrant example of the popularizing of American Catholic history at the expense of the Catholic reading public, who are offered this work with book-club endorsement and uncritical reviews as a scholarly answer to one of the most controversial questions now before the American public.

Beyond the fact that the book's contents do not come near to living up to its title—for at best it could honestly be called only the author's reflections on the Church in the United States (often interesting and well written)—it is full of errors of simply verifiable facts. To speak of a close consonance between Catholicism and the American idea is splendid, but, when the latter is never delineated, one may wonder legitimately if the author means the idea of democracy (and whose?), of separation of Church and State, or even of pragmatism. In a book aiming for popular appeal highly personalized opinions on history, sociology, literary criticism and political science may be tolerated, and even the taking on of scholars in these fields winked at, but there is no excuse for taking the hard-earned fruits of specialist researchers and wasting them through distortion. This is inevitable for the popularizer if he does armchair research and refuses to be interested enough in an item like a date to arise and verify its accurate

citation. Maynard's latest declaration of independence of research gives every indication that it was written without recourse to book, pamphlet or article.

To tip-toe through this garden of dilletantish daisies without stubbing a toe is impossible. For example, Columbus is given the long disproved Jewish strain (p. 6), Roger Williams is made a Baptist before leaving Massachusetts Bay (p. 7), the Puritans, despite Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards, are considered devoid of enthusiasm (p. 14). Charles Carroll's awareness of the consonance of the politics of the Founding Fathers and Catholicism is one of the earliest of many assumptions (p. 19), and the scholastic contributions through literary influence on Jefferson (which the author formerly joined with many in debunking) is here paraded forth as acceptable (p. 28). That Catholics wholeheartedly supported the Revolution—again a myth—is accepted but only after being rejected (pp. 32; 20-21). He forgets that the Spanish missions in California—by which Serra truly enough, though unknowingly, kept that area out of Russian hands—were first ordered secularized by the Spanish government (p. 38).

On some questions handled by Mr. Maynard the inaccuracies can be bundled together. The policy of Archbishop John Hughes a century ago in keeping the Irish out of colonies in the West is deplored more than once (pp. 41, 51). Yet it was not Thomas D'Arcy McGee but rather Fr. Jeremiah F. Trecy whom Hughes berated in his famous balcony scene for trying to sponsor the western movement in his see city (p. 121). And if it is to be maintained that the cramming of Irish into the eastern cities was a tragedy (pp. 122-23), at least the reader should be given time to forget this before he is told about how urbanization was the salvation of the American Church (p. 276). On Hughes in general a black imagination at times takes over, or at least a completely wild one. Hughes is pictured as thoroughly unlovable, although the fact is that he had moved quite graciously even in the best Philadelphia society before going to New York in 1838. When he was made coadjutor to Bishop Dubois, who was in his dotage and in the midst of administrative chaos, the younger man was eventually given powers of administrator. That the old bishop did not take it happily, despite Hughes' attempts to be kindly, is hardly sufficient reason to see more in it than just another instance when a bishop-coadjutor relationship did not

work out amicably in the American Church (p. 69). Other episodes involving Hughes are made up out of the whole cloth. The bishop never "acted in a diplomatic capacity" in making peace between the United States and Mexico, for his participation never got beyond a few exploratory conversations with the officials of the government at Washington (p. 69). The last moments of the visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States in February, 1854, are given the most fanciful description, with a mob at the dock in New York making it necessary for police to slip him out on a tender to a waiting ship. In fact, he was quietly taken to his ship by several priests by a roundabout way in fear of a *possible* demonstration. Moreover, Bedini's mission was not for the purpose of setting up a Delegation but a Nunciature in the United States (pp. 69-70).

A prejudice may show in looseness with facts, and this is especially true when dealing with a strong personality like Archbishop Hughes—or Bishop McQuaid of Rochester in the later part of the century. For Maynard, the Bishop of Rochester was truculent. Maynard points out that in spite of this bishop's protest that the numbers of the Italian population in his diocese were being exaggerated and a trip to Rome breathing fire to make this known, he returned and set up an Italian parish in 1906. But what is left out is the date of McQuaid's show of indignation which happened to be 1888 (p. 148). A letter from Cardinal Simeoni to Cardinal Gibbons is made to travel in the opposite direction and its words applying to the possible decree on Italian immigrants in the approaching Third Plenary Council of Baltimore which were supposed to read, "will discuss those provisions which it will believe to be opportune," become, "those *conditions* which *I* believe to be opportune" (p. 142). The article which would have supplied this data in straight fashion—and which the author lists in his bibliography—would also have made it clear that there was no doubt about Archbishop Corrigan's having asked Don Bosco for missionaries (p. 152). Finally on the Italians, there is a statement worthy of taking its place among famous exaggerated claims —such as Sir Shane Leslie's oft-lectured one on Leo XIII's verbal dependence on Cardinal Manning's writing in *Rerum novarum*. It is a statement unknown to previous historians to the effect that "It was largely (but by no means exclusively) with Italian conditions in mind" that the labor encyclical of 1891 was composed

(p. 145). It may be of interest to quote here an on-the-scene American observer at Rome of the origins of *Rerum novarum*. Msgr. Denis O'Connell reported on March 20, 1891, "The Pope is awaiting the arrival of the Count de Mun to get his views on that encyclical. Paul de Malajac says the Pope is trying to embody in it everybody's views. Card. Manning is in direct correspondence with the Pope" (O'Connell to John J. Keane, Archives of The Catholic University of America).

Another nationality group in the American Church may be taken as a sample of the author's disregard for accuracy. Using largely a sociology textbook and an article by a Protestant Portuguese writer, he presents a picture of the Portuguese Americans as mostly fishermen of a retiring and self-segregating type. In fact, the Portuguese in New England and California are among the important elements of the general population of those areas, not only from the point of view of the Church but economically, professionally, and politically as well. By this late day one might be expected to look beyond John Philip Sousa for the Portuguese contribution to American life. They have a large scale tuna fishing industry in San Diego, but the majority are farmers. The Portuguese in the United States have widely intermarried with other nationality groups and have produced a justice of the California supreme court, some of that state's richest landowners (probably seventy-five percent of its dairy farmers) and, for good measure, the dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University. Maynard's page on the Portuguese, including the old canard of "Moorish mixture," amounts almost to insult through inaccuracy (pp. 190-91).

The above comments are flagrant examples of the missing of available research or the twisting of what was at hand. The book's unproved and even unclarified thesis, its assumptions, gossip and guesses, glaring omissions, bad technique of sampling, intrusion of personal asides, bows to the Irish (in payment, perhaps, for Maynard's slights in the *Story of American Catholicism* in 1941) and the patronizing of other groups—none of these points have been entered into in detail in this review. Moreover, it may be mentioned in passing that no service has been done by the author's perpetrating two myths of American Catholic historiography, namely, first, that by reason of the striking candor of Zwierlein's three volumes on the life of Bishop McQuaid ecclesiastical archives

in this country were closed to later research workers, and, secondly, that the translation of the Abbé Klein's book on Americanism had to be virtually bootlegged in this country to get into print.

In extenuation of all this it may be argued that *The Catholic Church and the American Idea* is a popular work and will do more good than it can possibly do harm by spreading a knowledge of the history of American Catholicism and its consonance with American democracy. Too often the concern of reviewers with this type of book stops there. It might be well to recall that many such popularizations are called "scholarly" by the Catholic publishers and press, and intelligent readers are thus given a very poor impression of American Catholic scholarship. College graduates who major in American history in some of the superior secular colleges often know more of the history of the Church in this country than our newly-ordained priests. To recommend to such readers as these and even those less well prepared, something that shows little respect for historical accuracy is no service to truth. To say that only carping specialists will find fault may be true, but that does not excuse the palming off on the long-suffering "general reading public" of errors and inaccuracies as if they were the necessary corollaries of the art of popularization. There is a place, and even a profitable one, for those who will emancipate American Catholic history from footnotes—although those educated to demand the latter, it is hoped, will continue on the increase—but they will always have the obligation to keep popular history rooted in fact.

This book warns of professional jealousy among American Catholic specialists who feel that they have pre-empted certain fields of study, and it further laments the unhappy division between scholars and artists. It wisely, although perhaps prematurely, remarks that by way of reaction to the notion that a Catholic writer had to write a good book, "Catholic reviewers are beginning to bend backwards in dispraising a Catholic book if they can find the least reason for doing so" (p. 247). This reviewer, however, has attempted to follow only Maynard's own high but reasonable standards so often exhibited in his many reviews of books in the field of American Catholic history.

HENRY J. BROWNE

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

TOLERATION AND THE CHURCH-STATE CONTROVERSY

Very many of the Catholic weekly papers published in this country carried, during the last week of the past February, an account of a lecture about the interrelations of Church and state. The account, a brief recapitulation of what obviously must have been a fairly long address, ended with the following statement.

> If we consider the fact that the Holy Father has never censured those Catholic scholars and Bishops who have argued strongly in favor of religious toleration as being perfectly consistent with Catholic teaching, I think we may conclude that they have just as much right to maintain their position, as Catholics, as have their opponents.[1]

A great many of our people have taken this statement to refer to the recent discussion about the Catholic doctrine on the interrelations of Church and state, a discussion which has been carried on in American Catholic periodicals, *The American Ecclesiastical Review* among others, over the course of the past eight years. Thus they have come to see in this statement an implication that one side of the Church-state controversy was engaged in contending rather forcefully that religious toleration is not consistent with Catholic doctrine. Obviously, if one group of "Catholic scholars and Bishops" have been arguing "strongly" in favor of the thesis that religious toleration is compatible with Catholic teaching, it would seem to follow that their opponents have been arguing no less forcefully against that thesis. People do not argue "strongly" in support of a thesis which is not being denied and attacked with some measure of emphasis.

It is important to remember that the contemporary Church-state discussion is and has been from the outset a debate about the acceptability of a definite set of teachings. It is not, and it has never been, a kind of round-table affair at which various individuals offered what they considered the best practical approach to a current problem. Consequently, if there had been any denial of the compatibility of religious toleration with Catholic teachings, that denial would have been an integral part of the thesis presented

[1] I have cited this passage from the *Denver Register*, the national edition of Feb. 28, 1954. The passage is in quotes, as a direct statement of the lecturer.

and defended by one or the other of the two sides engaged in this controversy. It is not too difficult to show that neither of the two groups engaged in this debate ever thought of making any such denial.

In a paper read at the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, on Nov. 15, 1951, then published as an article in the Summer, 1952, issue of *Thought,* and finally reproduced in shorter form in the Autumn, 1953, number of *Theology Digest,*[2] the eminent Jesuit theologian, Fr. Gustave Weigel, has designated the men who have taken one of the sides of this Church-state debate as "the dynamic expositors," and has labeled their opponents as "the static expositors." Father Weigel informs his readers that his "sympathies and efforts favor" the former group, and presumably the classification of Fathers Shea and Connell as "static expositors" could be considered as an extraordinary effort in behalf of their opponents in this debate. Yet, despite the more than dubious fitness of the labels Father Weigel has affixed to the two groups taking part in the controversy, the fact remains that he acknowledges this controversy as a debate between two definite units, putting forward two definite and mutually incompatible interpretations of some Catholic teachings about the interrelations of Church and state.

A fairly complete bibliography is appended to the résumé of Father Weigel's paper in *Theology Digest.* It is unfortunate, incidentally, that the paper, "Church and State: Some Present Problems in the Light of the Teaching of Pope Pius XII," an article written by Cardinal Ottaviani and printed in the May, 1953, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* is not listed in this bibliography.[3]

An examination of the articles which have been written in support of both sides of this debate will show very clearly that neither group ever thought of denying that religious toleration was consistent with Catholic doctrine. Indeed, according to the résumé of Father Weigel's article in *Theology Digest,* the so-called "dynamic" group "proposes a fresh formulation of the Catholic theory of Church and State with a view to showing that there is

[2] Cf. *Thought,* XXVII, n. 105 (Summer, 1952), 165-84; and *Theology Digest,* I, 3 (Autumn, 1953), 169-73.

[3] Cf. *AER,* CXXVIII, 5 (May, 1953), 321-34.

no antagonism between it and the American arrangement, clearly defined in the first and tenth articles of the Bill of Rights attached to the original Constitution."[4] Quite obviously men who conceived their work along these lines are in no danger of holding or implying that religious toleration is in any way incompatible with Catholic doctrine. As a matter of fact, they have set out to present the Catholic teaching on this section of theology in such a way as to stress the fact that such toleration is definitely consistent with Catholic principles.

At the same time, however, it is obvious that none of the articles listed in the *Theology Digest* bibliography as the products of the "static" group in any way declares or implies that there is any opposition between religious toleration and Catholic doctrine. Moreover, there is no such statement and no such implication in the brilliant article by Cardinal Ottaviani, to which I have already alluded. There was never any controversy on this point at all. During the course of the debate there were many points disputed, but the compatibility of religious tolerance with Catholic teaching was not one of them. That is the fact of the matter, and it is a fact with very important practical consequences.

I am speaking of toleration as it is defined and explained in the allocution *Ci riesce,* the document, incidentally, with which the lecture reported in the NCWC news story is primarily concerned. This toleration exists when a Catholic state refrains from impeding or hindering a religious practice which is objectively opposed to truth and to the norms of morality, and thus refrains when it could, if it wished, move effectively against this practice. A denial that such toleration is consistent with Catholic doctrine would, in effect, constitute a rejection of the principle enunciated in the *Ci riesce,* to the effect that "failure to impede this [practice which does not correspond to truth or to the norm of morality] with civil laws and coercive measures can nevertheless be justified in the interests of a higher and more general good."[5]

There is absolutely no trace of any such denial in any of the papers written by what Father Weigel has been pleased to call the "static" group. There is, however, a somewhat disturbing argument employed by Father Weigel himself in his interpretation

[4] *Theology Digest,* art. cit., p. 169.
[5] Cf. *AER,* CXXX, 2 (Feb., 1954), 135.

of the position of these men. The distinguished Woodstock theologian has a habit of attributing to his opponents statements which they have never made, but which Father Weigel seems to consider as legitimate inferences from their genuine teachings. He has followed this practice in the area of Church-state teachings which have reference to toleration. As Father Weigel explains it: "According to Father Connell and Monsignor Fenton, any State at any time since Christ's death has the objective obligation to recognize the Catholic Church as the true religion. It must therefore defend the Church from all attacks, even, if necessary, suppressing freedom of speech in this area."[6]

Father Weigel has likewise interpreted our position as involving a rather uncomfortable and embarrassed position with reference to our federal constitution.

> . . . In spite of their knowledge of past literature and of the position of their opponents, the dynamic expositors simply cannot understand the final position of the static group. This position is that American Catholics can be loyal to, and satisfied with, the American Constitution, in spite of the fact that there is an objective obligation to go counter to it. How can they enthusiastically and sincerely accept the Constitution of the United States if one of its basic directives is an error which, according to them, every Catholic and even non-Catholic must deny? Does not such a stand make the Catholic's situation most ambiguous to himself and more so to his non-Catholic compatriots? Obviously the principle of tolerating what cannot be remedied is a sound one, but even toleration in the face of an objective obligation must do everything possible to correct the condition. An objective obligation induces in the tolerant man the intention of modifying circumstances in order to permit him to meet his obligation. Prudence certainly dictates that American Catholics do nothing now, because the turmoil would be shattering. However, could the Catholic be honest with his non-Catholic neighbors if he suppressed in silence his obligation to change the Constitution? Could the American Catholic who *de facto* feels no conflict between his religion and his Constitution be intelligently honest with himself? Do not the static expositors agree fundamentally with the claim of some that there is a chasm separating Catholicism and American democracy? A constant objective duty to reject one of the most characteristic features of the highest norm of his civic obligations would make any American's situation a strange one.[7]

---

[6] *Thought*, art. cit., pp. 170 f.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

It is interesting to compare Father Weigel's observations on the position of his theological opponents with regard to the federal constitution with what he teaches, in the same article, on the attitude of a once rather prominent anti-Catholic agitator with respect to American Catholics as a group.

> Men like Blanshard do not deny the *fact* of Catholic loyalty to American democracy. Nor do they deny that American Catholics do not believe that there is any opposition between their Catholic committments and their obligations as Americans. What they deny is that this position is logical in the light of the authoritative Catholic doctrine on Church and State relationships.[8]

Thus, in the eyes of Father Weigel, "men like Blanshard" are perfectly correct in their appraisal of those Catholics who accept as "the authoritative Catholic doctrine on Church and State relationships" what can be called *the* teaching of manuals of sacred theology and of public ecclesiastical law on this subject. Indeed, as Father Wiegel envisions the problem, "men like Blanshard" have been quite right unless it turns out that the standard manuals have been misrepresenting the Catholic position rather badly. We who accept the teachings of these manuals as true are attacked by Father Weigel on exactly the same grounds as those on which, according to him, "men like Blanshard" attack the general body of American Catholics. And, in the light of Father Weigel's position, it would seem that the contentions of the anti-Catholic agitators is wrong only because what has been generally taken to be Catholic doctrine on Church-state relations turns out, on further examination, not to be Catholic doctrine at all.

In order to see something of the implications of Father Weigel's teachings, we must understand how he envisions the basic position of those men against whom his sympathies and efforts are directed in the Church-state controversy.

> Those who belong to the opposition I shall henceforth call the static expositors. They clearly see that the dynamic expositors are not trying to remake Catholic doctrine nor do they accuse them of that. They also appreciate and laud the motives of the men who are engaged in the work of a fuller presentation of the Catholic position. However, they think the whole effort is needless, dangerous, and misleading. They

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

consider the statements current in the manuals and treatises dealing with the question quite satisfactory and believe they cannot be substantially improved. In their mind all that is needed is an honest and brave exposition of the current formulations; they think that any essays at expression from a different point of departure may unintentionally do violence to the data of Catholic doctrine, thus producing confusion and error.[9]

In general, the men who have worked and written on the side of what Father Weigel has, for some reason or other, chosen to call "the static expositors" would not accept his description of their stand as either accurate or adequate. On one point, however, his statement is quite correct. We do "consider the statements current in the manuals and treatises dealing with the question quite satisfactory and believe that they cannot be substantially improved." The statements or theses put forward, on the question of Church and state, by the standard works in sacred theology and in public ecclesiastical law are definitely quite satisfactory. These teachings are, as a matter of fact, expressions of assertions which have been set forth in the official documents of the Church's *magisterium*. They are the statements which have been proposed and are being proposed to the students in seminaries and universities as declarations of Catholic doctrine.

They certainly cannot be "substantially improved," if improvement is to involve any kind of transmutation or denial of the meaning which has hitherto been contained under these formulae. What can be designated as "the teaching of the scholastic theologians and of the teachers of public ecclesiastical law" is, on this point as on any other, something we do not intend to abandon or to change. It can and should be developed. Such development, however, could hardly be considered as an improvement of the basic teaching.

Now it is very interesting to note that Father Weigel imagines that the men who accept the teaching of the theological and juristic manuals as valid on matters of Church and state, and who object to any substantial change or rejection of these theses, should feel themselves obliged to change the federal constitution and must be considered as less than honest with their non-Catholic fellow citizens if they do not mention any such obligation on their part. He fancies that there is a question about our honesty with ourselves

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 169 f.

if we do not feel any conflict between our religion and our constitution.

It is to be remembered that our principal offense, indeed, as far as one can see, our only offense, is that we defend the validity of that teaching on Church and state which can properly be designated as *the* doctrine of the manuals of sacred theology and of public ecclesiastical law. Apparently it is because we are convinced that this doctrine is satisfactory and cannot be substantially improved, that we are represented by Father Weigel as questionably enthusiastic and sincere in our acceptance of our country's constitution and as placing our brother Catholics in a situation "most ambiguous" to themselves and more so to their non-Catholic fellow Americans.

We are not particularly disturbed to find statements like these made about our teaching. As a matter of fact, back in the summer of 1946, the rabidly anti-Catholic *Christian Herald* and the cocksure but befuddled religious editors of *Time* made a parallel accusation. *Time* put it this way:

> Nothing about Catholicism so confuses—and often dismays—U. S. Protestants as the stand of the Church on freedom of worship. Does Catholicism support the first article of the Bill of Rights? In U. S. practice, yes; in principle, no.[10]

Like the *Christian Herald*, the writer or writers in *Time* based this fantastically false charge on an obviously inaccurate interpretation of Father Connell's pamphlet, *Freedom of Worship*. This pamphlet, published in 1944, was itself a reprint of an article published in the magazine *Columbia* in December of the previous year. The teaching of that pamphlet is the body of doctrine proposed and defended by the men whom Father Weigel has chosen to call the "static expositors." The writers for the *Christian Herald* and for *Time* explained that teaching in much the same way that Father Weigel was to explain it some years later. As they interpreted it, it seemed to support the first amendment, and thus the constitution itself, in practice but not in principle.

It was my own privilege and pleasure to answer these attacks on Father Connell's teaching in the October, 1946, number of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*.[11] There was no difficulty involved

[10] *Time*, XLVII, 5 (July 29, 1946), 56.
[11] Cf. *AER*, CXV, 4 (Oct., 1946), 286-301.

in showing that this statement of the common teaching of our manuals of theology and of public ecclesiastical law in no way involved any implication that American Catholics accept and support the constitution as something to which the principles of the Catholic faith itself are opposed. The task was rendered still easier by reason of the fact that both the *Christian Herald* and *Time* had quoted passages from *Freedom of Worship* and had printed these citations as answers to questions asked by the editors themselves. To dispose of the charges made by the *Christian Herald* and by *Time,* it was only necessary to give an objectively and demonstrably accurate summary of *Freedom of Worship* and to point to the very manifest evidence that the citations from this pamphlet had been completely misinterpreted by the anti-Catholic commentators.

Unfortunately, it is much more difficult to answer Father Weigel. He has made no effort whatsoever to adduce any evidence to support his interpretation of our stand. He insists that "the dynamic expositors simply cannot understand the final position of the static group. This position is that American Catholics can be loyal to, and satisfied with, the American Constitution, in spite of the fact that there is an objective obligation to go counter to it." What actually defies understanding here is how such a position could be attributed to a group in clear defiance of all evidence to the contrary.

What Father Connell had to say on the question of tolerance in *Freedom of Worship* is precisely what the Holy Father taught last December in his allocution *Ci riesce.* Here are Father Connell's words.

> Nevertheless, even in a predominantly Catholic country, circumstances may render it more advisable for the government to grant non-Catholics the same measure of freedom of worship as is enjoyed by Catholics. Such a course is justifiable when it is foreseen that a policy of complete toleration will procure greater good than will repressive measures against anti-Catholic activities.[12]

Still more explicit is the following statement, also found in Father Connell's *Freedom of Worship.*

[12] *Freedom of Worship: The Catholic Position* (New York: The Paulist Press, 1944), p. 11.

Reasons for the policy of complete toleration on the part of Catholic states have been augmented in recent times, when international relations have become more intimate, and governments must regard themselves obligated to some degree toward the people of other lands as well as toward their own citizens. Accordingly, if it is foreseen that the granting of full civil rights to all religions within its own national territory will be beneficial to citizens of other nations, a Catholic country could be justified in adopting this policy. Indeed, a Catholic would not be inconsistent with any principle of his faith if he held that in the circumstances that prevail at the present time, it would be the most feasible plan to have complete religious toleration throughout the whole world. But it must ever be remembered that a Catholic cannot advocate such a plan on the basis that all religions have a genuine, God-given right to exist. Such a right belongs only to the one religion founded by Jesus Christ for all men.[13]

This stand was perfectly in accord with the main intention of Father Connell, which was to set forth, on this subject, the doctrine contained in the documents of the ecclesiastical *magisterium.* One of these documents, the famous encyclical *Immortale Dei,* written by Pope Leo XIII, contained this statement.

The Church, indeed, deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not, on that account, condemn those rulers who, for the sake of securing some great good or of hindering some great evil, allow patiently custom or usage to be a kind of sanction for each kind of religion having its place in the State.[14]

This express statement of the fact that religious toleration is perfectly consistent with the principles of Catholic doctrine turns out, upon examination, to have been an integral part of the teaching which Father Connell and his associates set out to expound and to defend. There is absolutely no excuse for an effort to depict these writers as having in any way expressed or implied any opposition whatsoever to this teaching.

Likewise there is absolutely no justification for representing the doctrine of Father Connell and his associates as in any way leading to or involving any such "final position" as that attributed

[13] *Ibid.,* pp. 12 f.

[14] The translation is that of *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII,* edited by Father Wynne (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 127.

to them by Father Weigel. The statement that such is our position at all is completely untrue. If, however, a man wishes to defend Father Weigel's thesis, and wants to try to show that we have involved ourselves in some "ambiguous situation" by reason of the stand we have taken in this controversy, it would seem only proper that he should take the trouble to point to some statements by some of our group which at least seem to support his contention.

Partly, it would seem, as a result of what Father Weigel has written, an impression has been spread abroad among some of those who are unfamiliar with the theological and juridical teachings involved, that the side of the controversy to which Father Weigel has devoted his sympathies and his efforts is in some way more American in tone or in tendency than that defended by Father Connell and his associates. Actually, nothing could be farther from the truth. And nothing could do more harm to the cause of Catholic truth in this country than the naive acceptance of such a misconception.

Truth is not a matter of nationality. When, in the Church-state discussion over the course of the last few years, various individual propositions were advanced by one side and disputed by the other, there was never, thank God, any question of accepting or rejecting a statement because it seemed more or less "American" than its opposite. It always seemed quite well understood that the discussion was being carried on by theologians, and on a scientific theological level. Thus when the validity of the concept of a "Catholic state" was defended and when we argued that a state made up of Catholics had a definite obligation, as a social unit, to worship God according to the rites of the true religion (which very definitely and obviously is not arguing against religious toleration in any legitimate sense of the term), we advanced these theses because and only because they were in line with the declarations of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* and with the teachings of Scripture and tradition. There are no other criteria which can properly be applied when such questions are to be considered.

It is extremely unfortunate that now, in what may be called a rather popular account of the controversy, there should be a tendency to convey the completely erroneous impression that one

side of this debate involved an argument against religious tolerance and some kind of opposition to the Constitution of the United States. It is all the more unfortunate to find a Catholic priest putting forward the idea that the men who have supported and defended what he seems to describe as the more common teaching of our manuals of sacred theology and of public ecclesiastical law have thereby put themselves in an ambiguous position in terms of an enthusiastic acceptance of the constitution.

There are certain truths which must be recalled because of the much-publicized quotation to which we referred at the beginning of this article.

1) There were no Catholic scholars and Bishops who, in the recent debate in this country, had to argue strongly that religious toleration was perfectly consistent with Catholic doctrine. There was never any denial of that truth.

2) People who taught this explicitly (as Father Connell did in *Freedom of Worship*), were never in any danger whatsoever of being censured by the Holy See. The Sovereign Pontiffs themselves have insisted on this truth.

3) Catholic Bishops, as a group, do not argue strongly (or any other way) in support of doctrines for which they feel that they may be censured by the Holy Father. Thus, to say that a doctrine proposed by our Bishops is acceptable precisely because it has not been censured by the Holy See is to spread abroad what is at least a confused impression of the episcopal teaching function.

* * * * *

During the first week of April, after the above pages had gone to press, many of the Catholic weekly papers in the United States carried, as an NCWC press despatch, an account of another well-publicized lecture on religious tolerance and the Church-state controversy in our country. The news story of this lecture was incomplete. In point of fact the lecture represented a serious attempt to give the impression that the Holy Father's allocution, *Ci riesce,* delivered on Dec. 6, 1953, to the *Unione dei Giuristi Cattolici Italiani* constituted or contained a repudiation of the teachings presented by Cardinal Ottaviani in the paper, "Church and State: Some Present Problems in the Light of the Teaching of Pope Pius

XII," and in the Lateran discourse of which this paper is a shortened but completely accurate expression. The news account of the lecture did not mention the Cardinal Pro-Secretary of the Holy Office, his address, or his article.

It was the contention of the lecturer that, since the appearance of the *Ci riesce,* those who have hitherto accepted the teachings of Cardinal Ottaviani's article as true are faced with the obligation of reconsidering and revising their position to avoid coming into opposition with the doctrine of the Sovereign Pontiff.

That, of course, is an extremely serious charge. It is also utterly baseless and incorrect.

Any careful, honest, and competent examination of the text of the *Ci riesce* and that of Cardinal Ottaviani's article will show that there is absolutely no point on which these two documents contradict one another. There is no statement in the article, "Church and State: Some Present Problems in the Light of the Teaching of Pope Pius XII," in any way contradicted, rejected, or repudiated in the text of the *Ci riesce.* There is no statement in either document which could in any way legitimately be interpreted as opposed to the spirit of the other.

The *Ci riesce* appeared in December, 1953. The March, 1954, issue of *Le séminaire,* the organ of the Grand Seminary, the theological school of the University of Montreal, carried a French translation of Cardinal Ottaviani's Lateran discourse. Obviously the Canadian theologians, who were doubtless aware of the content of the *Ci riesce,* did not believe that the acceptance of this papal teaching in any way necessitated a rejection of what the Cardinal Pro-Secretary of the Holy Office had said about Church and state.

On July 23 of last year a representative of the *New York Times* sought and obtained a clarification on the subject of the Cardinal's teaching from "a high Vatican source." He was told that this teaching was neither official nor semi-official, but that it was "unexceptionable." The account was picked up and printed in the Aug. 3, 1953, issue of the magazine, *Time.* If the statement of this "Vatican source" had been inaccurate, the Roman See, keenly conscious of its duty to protect the purity of the Catholic faith

throughout the world, would certainly never have allowed it to go without correction.

There are a great many students of sacred theology, in this country and throughout the world, who accept and propose as true what Cardinal Ottaviani has taught on Church-state relations in his Lateran discourse of March 2, 1953, and in the article he published in the May, 1953, number of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. I am one of them.

The Cardinal's position on the subject of Church and state is something which Catholic theologians can and should accept, not by reason of the Cardinal's own authority, but in the light of notably adequate theological evidence in its favor. The men who have taken that position do so because the clear statements of authoritative pontifical documents and manifestly valid demonstrations based on the sources of revelation point to that position as the only acceptable one.

As a matter of fact, when one reads the text of the Cardinal's article, it seems fantastic that a claim has been made that this teaching has been rejected or repudiated by the Sovereign Pontiff. What is presented in that article is a body of doctrine taught, and taught very forcefully, by Pope Pius XII and by Pope Leo XIII. What the Cardinal set out to do, and what he succeeded in doing, was to focus attention on the content of pontifical teaching with respect to the portion of the Church-state question with which his paper was concerned.

Where there had been opposition between what the Cardinal taught and what some Catholic teachers had written, the Holy Father, in the *Ci riesce*, whole-heartedly supported the Cardinal's position. Thus, for example, a writer opposed to the Cardinal had rejected the very term and the concept of the "Catholic state." The Cardinal used and explained the term and the concept in his paper. The *Ci riesce* bases its teachings on the validity of that term and of the corresponding concept.

Moreover, this same writer had quibbled against the use of the statement that error has no rights. The Cardinal defended and explained this proposition in his article. The *Ci riesce* is in complete agreement with the Cardinal, here as everywhere else it touches upon subjects with which he dealt.

In the last analysis, it is somewhat difficult to understand why there should be this opposition to the Cardinal's paper. What it had to say on the subject of Church and state was traditional teaching. It is simply what is contained and what has been contained in the great body of manuals in theology and in public ecclesiastical law which deal with this particular subject, the teaching of the *magisterium* itself.

What has attracted opposition to this paper may possibly be due to what the Cardinal had to say about the permanent validity of authoritative ecclesiastical doctrine. The Cardinal contended that "no one can prove that there has been any kind of change, in the matter of these principles, between the *Summi pontificatus* of Pius XII and the encyclicals of Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris* against Communism, *Mit brennender Sorge* against Nazism, and *Non abbiamo bisogno* against the state monopoly of fascism, on the one hand; and the earlier encyclicals of Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*, *Libertas*, and *Sapientiae christianae*, on the other."[15]

Those who would like to believe and to have others believe that authoritative pontifical teaching on this and other subjects has changed or "developed" in such a way that some things presented as true by Popes like Pius IX and Leo XIII have been completely or partially denied by more recent Pontiffs would not like what the Cardinal had to say on this subject. The *Ci riesce*, however, gives no support to their opposition, on this point or on any other.

It cannot be repeated too often or too urgently that the *Ci riesce* in no way contradicted any of the teachings contained in Cardinal Ottaviani's discourse or in his article. It carried absolutely no indication that the men who have agreed with the Cardinal on this point should in any way reconsider or revise their position. On the contrary, it gave new support to what is, after all, the standard teaching of Catholic manuals of fundamental dogmatic theology and of public ecclesiastical law.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[15] *AER*, CXXVIII, 5 (May, 1953), 328 f.

Answers to Questions

STIPENDS GIVEN TO A SCHISMATIC PRIEST

Question 1: May a Catholic give a stipend to an Oriental schismatic priest for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice?

Question 2: In the event that a Catholic in good faith has transferred to a schismatic priest stipends for Masses which he has bound himself (either in justice or in fidelity) to have offered, and the priest has offered the Holy Sacrifice the number of times stipulated, must the Catholic have the Masses offered again?

Answer 1: A Catholic is not permitted to give stipends for Masses to a schismatic priest. For one who gives a stipend for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice thereby becomes an active participant in the religious function; and such participation in the worship of non-Catholics is forbidden by the law of God, repeated in the Code of Canon Law (Can. 1258, §1). This principle is true even when the function in question is a valid eucharistic sacrifice, as it presumably is when offered by an Oriental schismatic priest. Such an act of worship is a sacred public function performed without the authorization of the Catholic Church, and hence it is opposed to the will of God. For this reason the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, on March 12, 1789, declared that the faithful may not give stipends to schismatic priests (*Collect. S.C.P.F.*, n. 600).

Answer 2: It would seem that when the Masses have been offered by a schismatic priest, the Catholic who transmitted the stipends would not be bound to have the Masses celebrated again, whether his obligation to have them offered was in justice or in fidelity. For the Masses were presumably valid; hence, the obligation was substantially fulfilled.

THE OBLIGATION TO ATTEND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION CLASSES

Question: May a priest make the statement that high school boys and girls are bound *sub gravi* to attend the religious instruction conducted for their benefit by the parish?

Answer: The statement may be made that boys and girls are bound *sub gravi* to acquire an adequate knowledge of their religion, especially at the present time when young folks are subjected to so many dangers to faith and morals. But it would not be correct to say that they are bound *sub gravi* to attend the instruction classes available under the parish auspices. The parents of these children have the first obligation and right to instruct them in Christian doctrine and morality (Can. 1113); hence, if the parents wish to assume this duty themselves and are capable of performing it satisfactorily, it cannot be said that *ipso facto* they or their children are guilty of mortal sin by the fact that these latter do not attend instruction classes. Of course, the pastor has the right and duty to inquire and investigate in such a situation, whether the children are receiving adequate instruction and guidance from their parents. Moreover, if a bishop makes a ruling for his diocese that all boys and girls shall attend Christian doctrine classes, all are bound by this ruling. Finally, in the supposition that the non-attendance of certain boys and girls at the instruction classes (even though they were receiving adequate instruction at home) were a source of scandal to others, they would be bound to attend.

If, however (as is often the case), the parents are not otherwise providing an adequate course of instruction for their sons and daughters, it can be asserted that these boys and girls are bound *sub gravi* to attend the parish instruction classes. But to make such a statement without taking into consideration the rights and duties of parents would be incorrect.

PREDETERMINING THE SEX OF AN INFANT

Question: I have heard that experiments have been attempted to predetermine a child's sex, so that a couple can choose to have either a boy or a girl. The method consists in the use of a drug by the husband which will render sterile all the spermatazoa which would produce the unwanted sex, so that if conception does occur the offspring will necessarily belong to the desired sex. What is to be said of the morality of such a procedure?

Answer: While abstaining from passing any judgment on the scientific aspect of the process described in order to predetermine a child's sex, I do not hesitate to state that from the moral aspect it is to be condemned. For it is a form of eugenic sterilization,

inasmuch as it involves the direct destruction of the fertility of a portion of the semen, and hence is contrary to the law of God

The further question as to the morality of predetermining a child's sex by any means whatsoever naturally presents itself. Of course, if the method employed any procedure against God's law (such as is present in the case described, and would be present if it consisted in the adding to the husband's semen spermatazoa from another man) it would have to be rejected absolutely as immoral. If it consisted merely in taking certain drugs or food that would not have any destructive effect on the semen, it would seem permissible. But surely, from the Christian standpoint, it would be better for prospective parents not to make use of such methods, but rather to leave it entirely to God to determine whether they are to have a boy or a girl. There is grave reason to fear that if science ever discovers a way of predetermining the sex of children, there will be even more troubles in the world than there are at present.

THE COMMUTATION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE

Question: Pope Clement VII granted the superiors of religious orders the authority to extend to the members of their communities a commutation of the Divine Office by substituting certain prayers, including six or seven psalms. Now, among some religious there is uncertainty as to the interpretation of the word *psalms* in this connection. Must it be taken as referring to six or seven psalms as distinct in the Bible, or as distinct in the Breviary? For example, the single (according to the Scripture) psalm 118 is divided into eleven psalms in the Little Hours of the festive Office.

Answer: On the principle that *favores sunt ampliandi,* I believe that the divisions of a single psalm according to the Breviary can be regarded as distinct psalms for the use of the commutation described. Hence, a religious superior possessing the faculty mentioned by the questioner could assign the psalms of Tierce and Sext of the festive Office as the required portion of the commutation. However, the most practical solution would be for the superior to choose six or seven distinct psalms (according to the Bible) of moderate length for the fulfilment of this condition.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

SILVER JUBILEE QUERIES

Question: At the forthcoming silver jubilee celebration of our pastor, is he permitted to have an assistant priest at the Solemn High Mass? Is there any special Mass or prayer that can be said at this jubilee Mass?

Answer: According to the Code of Canon Law (Can. 812) only bishops and prelates are allowed to have an assistant priest, by reason of their dignity or the solemnity of the occasion being celebrated. Custom permits (S.R.C. No. 3564) a newly ordained priest to have an assistant priest at his first Mass, whether it be a low Mass or a Solemn Mass. No provision has ever been made, according to the books, for an assistant priest at the silver or golden jubilee of "sacerdos simplex."

No special Mass is designated for the jubilee of a priest. However, he is free to choose whatever Mass he wishes, if the anniversary falls on a day when a votive Mass is permitted. Other than that he is allowed to add to the already prescribed prayers of the day, the oration *pro seipso sacerdote* (No. 20 in the *orationes diversae*). This is recited after the prescribed prayers but before the *imperata* if one exists. This prayer No. 20 may not be added on a double of the first class or on Palm Sunday, or the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION

Question: Must the prayer recited when distributing Holy Communion be said over each particle? In a recent discussion some priests held that it need be recited only once for every two persons receiving Holy Communion.

Answer: All rubricians hold that the celebrant makes the sign of the cross with each Sacred Particle while saying aloud the prescribed prayer, "Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi . . ." in its entirety for each person receiving Holy Communion. No short cut is permitted because of crowds or feebleness of the priest distributing Holy Communion.

BENEDICTION PROBLEM

Question: We have a small shrine dedicated to Our Blessed Lady. Certain times of the year the crowd attending devotion is

very large and much too great to be accommodated in the chapel of the shrine. May the celebrant at Benediction give the blessing twice, once from the predella and then step down to the entrance of the shrine and give it a second time for those who have not been able to gain entrance into the chapel proper?

Answer: We see no justification in giving the blessing with the Monstrance twice. The circumstances are unusual and since it is not the ordinary procedure, why not have the celebrant step down from the predella and stand at the entrance of the shrine and there give the Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament so that all may see him?

HOLY COMMUNION AT AFTERNOON MASS

Question: Recently a member of my parish questioned one of the priests about the regulation for receiving Holy Communion at an afternoon Mass. We have Mass at five o'clock on Wednesday afternoon during Lent. Does the person communicating need to be fasting three hours before the beginning of Mass or three hours before the actual time of Holy Communion?

Answer: Father Ford comments in his book (*The New Eucharistic Legislation*) that both priest and faithful are permitted to eat up to three hours before the beginning of Mass or Holy Communion.

CELEBRANT AT HIGH MASS

Question: At a Solemn High Mass must the celebrant wait until the choir has finished the response before proceeding further, e.g. at the end of the *Pater Noster* or after the *Ite missa est* and *Benedicamus Domino?*

Answer: Rubricians direct the celebrant at Solemn High Mass to wait until the choir has sung "Sed libera nos a malo" before saying the "Amen" and continuing with the Mass. The celebrant is directed to turn back to the altar after the *Ite missa est* and start the *Placeat.* He need not wait for the choir to sing the *Deo gratias* to the *Ite missa est* or *Benedicamus Domino* before beginning the *Placeat.*

Rubricians make this interesting notation about the *Benedicamus Domino* and *Requiescant in pace.* The celebrant recites these in a subdued voice while the deacon sings them. The same is not true for the *Ite missa est.* Fr. Laurence O'Connell remarks that the reason for this is that the *Ite missa est* is not considered a prayer while the *Benedicamus Domino* and *Requiescant in pace* are.

FIRST FRIDAY AND FUNERAL MASS

Question: Recently we had a funeral Mass on First Friday when we are accustomed to have all day Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. One of the priests placed the Blessed Sacrament back in the tabernacle and after the funeral Mass exposed it again. Is this correct procedure? I argued it was wrong.

Answer: Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament could have been delayed until after the funeral Mass. But since that was not done, the correct procedure would have been to conclude the Exposition with *Tantum ergo* and Benediction before the funeral Mass. The Blessed Sacrament must not just be placed in the tabernacle. After the funeral Mass, regular Exposition would take place again and, later during the day, reposition with benediction.

MINOR BASILICA

Question: Recently I was in a church designated as a minor basilica and I noted there a decoration in the sanctuary that looked much like an umbrella, made of yellow and red material. What is the meaning of this ornament?

Answer: A minor basilica has two ornaments that distinguish it from other churches. One is the large colorful umbrella of which our inquirer speaks and the other is a gold bell attached to a pole.

The umbrella is so constructed that it cannot be fully spread but remains only half open. It is made of red and yellow silk in twelve alternate strips, six yellow and six red with contrasting pendants which are braided and fringed in yellow. The handle is an ordinary banner pole. The entire ornament is topped with a ball surmounted by a cross, both of gilt metal.

The precise origin of this umbrella is not known. It is probable that it is derived from a large umbrella or parasol which in ancient times was kept at the various Roman basilicas to be held over the head of the Roman Pontiff whenever he visited the basilica to officiate or attend services. In the course of time the Popes gradually ceased to make actual use of the umbrella or *conopaeum*, but the clergy stationed at the basilica continued to have one in readiness in case the Pope should ever have need of it.

While the umbrella is located on the Epistle side of the sanctuary, the other distinguishing ornament, the bell, is on the Gospel side. The origin of the bell is not much clearer than that of the umbrella. Probably it was used to signal the clergy when to start the procession to meet the Pope at the door of the basilica. It is like other bells, but it is small, being not more than six inches in diameter at the bottom. It is mounted usually on an elaborate framework of metal or wood that is gilded and then fastened to the top of a banner pole, a sort of portable belfry.

Both the umbrella and the bell are carried in every procession inside or outside of the basilica, except for those processions of a funeral nature. They are borne after the processional cross, with the umbrella being carried after the bell.

COMMUNION OF THE MASS BY THE CHOIR

Question: Precisely when does the choir sing the communion of the Mass? There seems to be a variance of opinions in our rectory.

Answer: The communion of the Mass is sung by the choir immediately after the celebrant has consumed the Precious Blood. Father O'Connell says that if Holy Communion is distributed the communion may be sung during this time. If there are a large number of communicants the choir may sing some other chants, as the psalms. Hymns in the vernacular may not be sung at this time.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

THE TRINITY IN OUR SPIRITUAL LIFE. An Anthology of the Writings of Dom Columba Marmion, O.S.B. Compiled by Dom Raymund Thibaut, O.S.B. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1953. Pp. 284. $3.50.

One of the spiritual landmarks in the life of Abbot Columba Marmion was his consecration to the Blessed Trinity which he made in 1908 while at the Abbey of Mont-Cesar, Louvain.

In this anthology of the Abbot's reflections on the Trinity and the spiritual life, the compiler makes Dom Marmion speak for himself through short selections from: *Christ, the Life of the Soul; Christ, in His Mysteries; Christ, the Ideal of the Monk; Union with God in Christ;* and from his private notes on the spiritual life appearing in *A Master of the Spiritual Life.* As is evident this runs the gamut of Dom Marmion's spiritual works edited so far.

The appearance of a new book on Abbot Marmion is always good news to all who admire the solid foundations of Benedictine spirituality. The Abbot consistently draws not so much from the purely personal as from the pure Tradition of the Church and as we read additional works on Dom Marmion we realize more and more that his writings are firmly established on sound theological principles and the infallible doctrine of the Church. We feel at once that Catholic sense and wholesomeness which come from a deep knowledge and love of the Scriptures, the Fathers, the great theologians and the liturgical prayer of the living Church. Dom Marmion's special grace was to see and to experience in an extraordinary way the intimate union between these sources and true Catholic asceticism. The basic idea then of this anthology is excellent since it makes the careful reader appreciate the sources and the development of sound spiritual principles.

The success of Abbot Marmion's writings certainly does not depend on freshness of presentation or easy style; in fact, they are successful in spite of a difficult style which makes great demands on the reader because of its pedantic complexity. As the compiler notes, Dom Marmion's reflections were written with a single stroke of the pen, rapidly and without correction. Matter and not style are the great Abbot's chief concern. Dom Thibaut is to be commended then for the unity and the clarity he has achieved in the difficult task of selecting suitable extracts from Dom Marmion's works.

Although we recommend this book for general spiritual reading, we do feel that it is more admirably suited for meditative reading. In this Dom Marmion speaks for himself: "I have received a strong interior light on the manner of honoring the Trinity and of acting in such a way that all our spiritual life may consist of a perpetual 'Gloria Patri.' These reflections provide me with a framework of meditation" (Louvain, Jan. 20, 1906).

MATTHEW MICELI, C.S.C.

SERMONS ON THE LITURGY. For Sundays and Feast Days. By Pius Parsch. Translated by Philip T. Weller. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1953. Pp. xii + 332. $5.50.

Many of us are familiar with Father Parsch's renowned *Das Jahr des Heiles* (The Year of Salvation) which is slowly finding its way into English by way of digests and bits and pieces and which the Benedictines of The Liturgical Press of St. John's Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota, have promised to bring out in a complete edition. This volume is not a part of that monumental work but is a newer, fuller and more developed, better organized presentation of the same subjects—the truths of the faith in their liturgical settings. There are thirteen volumes to this set and the present volume is Volume V of *Die Liturgische Predigt,* as the new work is called.

There are sixty sermons in this book, one for each Sunday of the liturgical year and for the great feasts such as Epiphany, Ascension, Pentecost, Christ the King and All Saints. Each sermon covers from six to seven pages. A brief foreword is prefixed to each sermon which points out the chief lessons so that the reader sees the sermon in its proper setting, which is followed by a summary of the sermon.

The Foreword of the sermon for Passion Sunday will illustrate how Father Parsch presents the topic:

> The specific lesson for this Sunday can be found in three themes: Christ the High Priest, the cross, and the suffering of our Lord. . . . After meditating on the outward sufferings of Christ it is most fitting that the Christian people be led to reflect on the more significant element in the Passion, His sacrifice and priesthood. From this there is an easy transition to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and likewise to the thought of our personal suffering in union with Christ. . . . The following sermon presents the suffering of Christ from the viewpoint of the effect it should have on the way we spend our lives (p. 131).

In his introduction Father Parsch says that the instruction of the faithful is one of the original and basic functions of divine worship.

The sermon is a means to strengthen people in their faith and in directing them in Christian living. This Father Parsch admirably fulfills in these sermons which were given to the people in his little parish of St. Gertrude near the monastery of the Canons of St. Augustine to which the author belongs.

In the sermon for the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany the author applies the parables of the leaven and the mustard seed to the three concrete provinces of the Kingdom of God in this world, namely: the universal Church, the parish, the individual soul. When he applies it to the parish we get an excellent look inside at St. Gertrude's parish which will help any priest to take a better and a more comprehensive view of his own flock (pp. 86-87).

Usually a book of sermons does not have much popular appeal. We feel that this book should be brought to the attention of that number of intelligent laity that grows numerically greater each year so that they can more fully participate in the Mass of the Sunday, which will become a leaven in any parish. We highly recommend this book to priests who may thus benefit from the scholarly research and parochial experiences of Father Parsch.

PASCHAL BOLAND, O.S.B.

THE PRIEST OF TODAY. By Rev. Thomas O'Donnell, C.M. New York: McMullen, 1953. Pp. xv + 333. $3.50.

To appreciate this book, we must study the brief preface to the first edition, that is dated All Hallows College, Dublin, All Saints Day, 1909. Father O'Donnell says in part, "In substance the principles that should govern clerical life are the same in every century; only in their application do they differ. A priest is always and everywhere an ambassador of Christ, *but he is also the child of his age and the citizen of his native or his adopted country*. Hence the priest of today, while seeking God's Kingdom in the first place, should in all things lawful accommodate himself to the modern world, and should act in sympathy with the people whom he desires to serve" (italics ours).

Note the date particularly. The book was published near the close of a bygone era. The forty-odd years (nearly half a century) that have elapsed since then have brought about profound changes in the *mores* of Christendom as well as in the rise and fall of empires and nations. Probably greater than any other half-century in the history of the world.

In view of Father O'Donnell's prefatory statement, he would no doubt be the first to declare that the book should be entirely rewritten. The Preface to the seventh edition mentions rewriting, but adds, "Nevertheless it seems better on the whole to allow the present edition to go to press with only a few minor alterations and additions." A few alterations and additions are not sufficient to bring it up to date. It does not cover modern problems except as they are of the perennial type; it treats of the labors of a priest in Ireland generations ago, not the difficulties confronting a priest in America today.

We look in vain for a chapter on problems of youth—except as they arise incidentally in Confession, catechism classes, and school—and none of these are given the extensive treatment vital to combat the current increasing trend toward youthful immorality. True, paternal discipline was strict, and modern stimulus and opportunity practically non-existent. Mixed marriages, probably the source of the greatest loss to the Church, also receive a cursory treatment. Such marriages may not be much of a problem in Ireland, but in the United States the proportion is high in most places, and many of the children of mixed marriages are lost to the Faith.

The author urges frequently that absolution be given to children, even small children; and the dominant tone of his treatment of Confession and Communion is that of the time when the pronouncement of Blessed Pius X was not yet well disseminated and accepted.

The matter of forming a choir is casually regarded. Says Father O'Donnell, "A dozen children from eight to twelve years of age can be got together occasionally, and if they do not know the Tonic Sol-fa system, they could be taught it by means of a chart or blackboard." Tell that to your children's choir leader; the reply may be anything from torrid to frigid, but enlightening.

The literary style is not that of today but naturally the diction of forty years ago.

Nonetheless a new pastor or an assistant in a modern American parish would profit by a sincere reading and examination of conscience on the matter set forth. A majority of pastoral problems are age-old, constant. These Father O'Donnell treats well. On p. 104 there is a quotation from St. Robert Bellarmine on concealment of sins in Confession, ending ". . . Priests have the disadvantage that they are seldom if ever reminded of the effect of a repulsive manner in the confessional." Too, too true. And other authorities, too little known these days, are quoted. Also there are many practical suggestions, including a list of questions for the confessional.

For the priest who must deal with today's heavy problems, there is inspiration and new strength in Father O'Donnell's words that the principles which should govern clerical life are the same in every age, differing only in their application to serve the flock of his era and his country.

A new book (preserving the message of the preface), but written to aid the priest of today to guide the people through the unprecedented pitfalls of our era is deeply needed and should be written.

H. D. BUCHANAN

A DOCTOR AT CALVARY. The Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ, as described by a surgeon. By Pierre Barbet, M.D. Translated by the Earl of Wicklow. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1954. Pp. 178. 12 reproductions, $3.00.

The author of this book is a French physician and until recently senior surgeon of a Catholic hospital in Paris. The translator is an Irish nobleman converted to Catholicism in 1931. The book pursues a double objective. Its primary scope is that of explaining from a medical point of view just how our Divine Lord suffered and died. The second objective is to prove the authenticity of the Holy Shroud of Turin. Although the author protests the latter to be subordinate to this theme, it decidedly looms very large in his book and in his mind. As a matter of fact, it probably marks the weakness of the book for those readers—including the present reviewer—who even upon weighing the arguments of Dr. Barbet remain unconvinced of the authenticity of the Shroud and fail to share his almost passionate conviction. A certain ambiguity pervades these arguments. Most of them are in the following vein: the Gospels, literary tradition, archeological and anatomical considerations furnish records indicating the kind of wounds inflicted upon the body of Jesus; precisely such markings are found on the Holy Shroud; therefore the Shroud has to be authentic. Occasionally the line of argument seems to be reversed. For example, with regard to the place where the nails were driven through Christ's hands the author so argues: the Holy Shroud clearly manifests a wound in the wrist of the Crucified; consequently the nails did not pierce the palms of the hands but rather the center of the wrists. In such cases, authenticity of the Shroud being taken for granted is supposed to decide the issue.

In our opinion the real value of the work lies in the author's medical and anatomical analysis of the physical sufferings and death of Our Lord. Surgeon Barbet tested his theories experimenting on corpses, amputated arms and legs by giving them a treatment analogous to that

of the Passion described in the Gospels. Of equal interest is the exposition of what archeology, literary texts and artistic documents tell us about crucifixion. Dr. Barbet closely follows the study made by Father Holzmeister, S.J., on this problem.

Here are some samples of the author's opinions. The Cross of Christ was in T form; the *stipes* or vertical piece of wood stood fixed permanently on Calvary; Christ carried the *patibulum,* the horizontal piece of wood, throughout the way of the Cross; the Cross had no footrest; the crown of thorns was rather in the form of a cap made of thorny branches, kept in place by a band of plaited rushes around the head; the blow of the lance was a regulation act to be carried out by the military guard that the body might be handed over for burial; the blow was struck at the right side of the chest, penetrating to the right auricle of the heart and perforating the pericardium, so that the "water" flowing from the wound was pericardial fluid; the determining cause of Jesus' death was a tetanic condition of the whole body and asphyxia.

Although the reader may not always agree with the author's explanations—some of which are rather individualistic as evidenced in the frequent use of the pronoun "I"—he will be impressed by the profound piety and Catholic tone given by Dr. Barbet. Priests will find in his book much good material for sermons on the Passion.

JAMES VAN DER VELDT, O.F.M.

SELF-PORTRAIT OF JESUS CHRIST: THE HOLY SHROUD OF TURIN. By Edward A. Wuenschel, C.SS.R. Esopus, New York: Holy Shroud Guild, 1954. Pp. 126.

It would seem to be a fair and logical approach to the evaluation of a current book to state the qualifications not only of the author but also of the reviewer. The present reviewer can claim one questionable advantage—the fact that he approached the reading of Father Wuenschel's defense of the Shroud of Turin with nothing more than an ordinary understanding of the relic and its background of controversy among the experts, with the result that there was no strong *a priori* inclination one way or the other to influence the reading. Concerning the author, much more can be said.

Father Wuenschel's qualifications to handle the matter of his study are impressive. He has written and lectured extensively on the subject of the Shroud of Turin; and, what is far more important, he has studied the problem carefully. It is hardly risking an overstatement to say that the Sacred Shroud has been the one absorbing interest of the mature

years of the author's life and the object of reverent study. Moreover, the purpose of the present volume is to write a popular presentation of the controversy concerning the Shroud, and Father Wuenschel is well equipped for the task. He can claim the accomplishment of having made a very readable book of what could easily have been a deadly boring marshaling of facts and authorities, arguments and counter-arguments.

There is no intention of impugning the scholarship of Father Wuenschel's work in stating that at times he seems to step across the almost imaginary line that distinguishes an emphatic and legitimate rejection of a line of reasoning of opponents and sheer exasperation with what one considers obdurate resistance to the presentation of facts and arguments. Father Wuenschel plainly admits that there are "arguments that still convince most Catholic historians, exegetes and theologians that this is a false relic" (p. 62). Yet on p. 19 he states almost impatiently: ". . . the painting hypothesis is absurd, no matter what any written documents may say to the contrary." Later, referring to the opponents of the Shroud on the ground of Scriptural interpretation—Catholic Scripture scholars—he contends that their objection remains the same as it was fifty years ago, merely proposed today in a more scholarly guise; and he quotes St. Augustine: "You take long strides, but in the wrong direction." The author calls another unwilling spokesman against the exegetes when he adapts Shakespeare to qualify the Scriptural argument against the aloes as "nothing but sound and fury" (p. 69). The author may insist that this is not meant as exasperation but as a popular presentation of his counter-arguments. The reviewer feels that there is very much in the book to appeal to readers well above the popular level. And may we spare the historians, exegetes, and theologians to the last reasonable limit, especially when we are considering *most* of them. We need them.

What has been said above has nothing to do with the solidity of the author's presentation. To say the least, Father Wuenschel presents in the small compass of his book a very reasonable defense of the Sacred Shroud of Turin. There is no angle passed over, but point by point the author deftly guards the Shroud against every attempt to explain away its authenticity. There is little advantage in reviewing the matter of the book here, for the general outlines of the controversy concerning the Shroud are too well known to need any rehearsal, and a too-close analysis of the matter of the book may only serve to dull the appetite for the book itself—and the book certainly deserves to be read. It is an absorbing piece of work, sharpened by fifteen photographs and concluded by a bibiography of more than eighteen pages as a guide to further study. There is no attempt to minimize the value of the rest

of the book when the reviewer calls attention to the excellent last chapter, "The Popes and the Shroud."

In his Preface, Father Wuenschel admits that the present book is not the final defense of the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin when he calls it "a preliminary summary of a larger work in which the case will be presented more completely with a full documentation." And with both sides we can all await the ultimate scientific analysis of the Shroud itself. The time will probably come when the microscope will examine the stains of the Shroud to determine the presence of tissue and blood cells, and the fabric to determine its nature to see whether it is truly linen. Radio-carbon dating can be a help to determine the age of the Shroud; the X-ray can gaze in judgment over the hypothesis of its being a painting of the fourteenth century; and the spectroscope can detect the composition of all the stains. Truth has nothing to fear from science.

GILES STAAB, O.F.M.CAP.

THEOLOGIA ORIENTALIS. By Nicola Ladomerszky. Rome: Bibliotheca Pontificia Urbana, Propaganda Fide, 1953. Pp. 437. $6.00.

The qualifications of Professor Ladomerszky are a guarantee as to the authority and value of this presentation of the subject. It is written in clear, simple, fluid Latin that will present no difficulty, even to persons not ordinarily making use of Latin textbooks. The format, print, paper, and arrangement of the contents are of rare excellence.

This work has a special significance in these days when there appears to be a stirring of the waters on the question of our separated brethren. Ordinarily, a textbook appeals only to those who have a technical interest in the subject matter. This book is of interest to more than the theologians. For besides being a textbook, it is an up-to-date, competent presentment of the whole wide and living question of the separated Oriental Churches, including that of Russia, written by one in day-to-day contact with its present unfolding: a question furthermore that is coming to be of interest to more and more people, and would be to yet more should it be brought competently to their notice by readers of this book.

Catholics are awakening to an instinct long dormant, for historical reasons, for the return to union with them of so many separated nations, racial heirs for the most part of a great tradition: the gifted children, in a manner of speaking, of Chrysostom, of the Basils, the Gregorys, the Cyrils, and a host of other great and holy names. It was

through their wisdom and genius, humanly speaking, and through their union with the See of Peter, which guided their activities, that were hammered out the enduring, authoritative forms that give expression to the teaching of the Church on the great central truths of the Incarnation of the Word.

The wisdom of the Greek Fathers remains with us, our ever appreciating treasure, more than ever valued as being, together with the wisdom of the Fathers of the West, the key, apart from formal definition, to the meaning and to the contents of the words of Holy Writ. But where from our midst are they from whom the Eastern Fathers have sprung? This is a question that touches us profoundly; we who have, as it were, forgotten why they are not with us, and wish only for their return, for their company in the Communion of Saints, for their assistance in spreading the Gospel. It seems this feeling finds echo among them. Professor Ladomerszky here carefully describes the many efforts toward union as well from the Oriental as from the Catholic side.

The present reviewer ventures on the suggestion that this work offers a reliable source from which any priest, or other persons competent, may draw accurate, up-to-date, and profoundly interesting material for lectures on this significant theme. Indeed, to do so would be a good and apostolic activity, helping toward a most desirable end. What, one may sometimes ask, is to happen when the night of Communist oppression has gone the way of history? Are separation and schism to go on without end; breeding fresh divisions, fresh weaknesses, fresh disasters, to the human spirit?

The union this scholarly work aims at could well be the beginning of the union of mankind. It is significant that the Iron Curtain seems to have fallen, more or less, along the line of an earlier curtain that sundered the Christian obedience, and behind which men continued to believe and practice the Christian faith, not acknowledging, however, its divinely appointed Head, the Rock of Peter upon which the living faith was founded, the "perpetual principle and visible foundation of unity" to which alone the promise was made that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.

In the concluding sentence of his book Professor Ladomerszky says that "Catholics will fulfil a truly apostolic work who earnestly strive to dissolve the psychological difficulties that lie between, and so render easier the path to the long desired union. Their reward will be the blessing of God who died for His Church, the One and Catholic." May Monsignor Ladomerszky's fine work substantially assist toward this